



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06817677 9

RIGHT AND WRONG

BY

WILLIAM A. STURDY

1

—

2

★ Publishers Weekly

Sept. 17 1907

177



U. S. LIBRARY
1897
13.3.

RIGHT AND WRONG

RELATING TO

LITERAL ETHICS

AND A

POPULAR FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

— — — — —

SHOWING THE DEFECTIVE CHARACTER OF WEBSTER'S
DICTIONARY WITH ITS INFLUENCE UPON THE
DISTURBANCES BETWEEN THE RULING
CLASS AND THE COMMON LABORER.

— — — — —

BY WILLIAM A. STURDY.

— — — — —

ATTLEBORO, MASS.:
PUBLISHED BY SWEET & STURDY.
1891.

408592

PREFACE.

It is a thankless task to suggest any reform that reflects upon the authority of the literally learned, but the reward for performing a duty is the consciousness of doing it. Therefore, in this defence of the rights of humanity, the favor of the learned is neither courted, or their power feared. Methods are always subordinate to the right of expression, and without the recognition of a free expression of opinion the theory of popular government would be a farce. Also for the learned to claim credit for the American idea of government, is for the master to proclaim he civilized his fellow-men by enslaving them. The fact that knowledge rules, will not justify the assertion, "the literally learned rules," because they in literal terms can exclaim, "the men of knowledge rule."

The suffrage system of modern governments is a reproach to literal authority as derived from Webster's dictionary, for this book is biased in the interest of human oppression. It protects the traditions of the past, and while the theory of the divine rights of Kings and supreme authority of masters over their slaves has been exploded by the success of American Independence, the dictionary of the English language maintains a justification of this exploded theory. Social peace is not possible, or could it even be hoped for, while the public schools rely upon a

standard authority for words, which practically denies that illiterate people have any rights that the learned are bound to respect.

People are no freer than of old, if the teacher of the present is but the master of old, and to enslave the mind of a being in one's own likeness, is far worse than to enslave the body, for in the latter case a ray of hope would still be left. The assumed authority of man over man can find no justification in the established principle of popular government. If literal authority is the ruling principle of social happiness, there would have been no need for men to elect themselves the masters of the world, by giving words special meanings, to hide from the innocent pupil the authority of his master. It is not expected that the literally learned will take kindly to any exposure of the methods by which a people, proclaimed to be free, are deceived; but it is none the less true, if it must first be pretended by the literal authority for words which are innocently learned by children, that man's authority is equal to the power of conception. The double meanings of words, give the appearance that man can bestow *knowledge* upon his kind, and if such is the case, the principle of suffrage is a farce. Besides what gives the dictionary its most un-American significance is, the studied effort to justify the authority of the learned over the social relations of man, while the American principle of government proclaims him to be free. The question is: Why should we be taught an obedience to a literal authority, that was purposely prepared to protect a principle, particularly obnoxious to the advanced intelligence of

Americans? The dictionary also bears witness against itself, that the teaching of morality is impossible, from the necessity of the studied deception, to disguise the iniquity of teachers who posed as examples of honesty and virtue in their defence of human bondage.

This book appeals to all persons who possess any feeling of charity toward the silent masses of humanity, and for no other reason than the lack of a simple method of expression, they are charged by the more literally learned with a natural depravity because of a disposition to wickedness. The proof of it would seem to be that the more learned could not resist the tempting power of wickedness, by taking an advantage of ignorance, to evade the common necessity of work. Therefore, all literal ethics that embrace the authority to teach, are based upon a traditional inheritance that man is born depraved. If this is so what hope can there be, when the learned derive their power from the defence of a fraud?

The force by which man is conceived is a state that can never be subordinate to a state which is constructed by the consciousness of this force. The confusion of this principle is recorded in Webster's dictionary, and if the learned of the present day will defend a book which was purposely prepared to make the precepts of the Bible subordinate to a specific version dependent upon the definition of words, the object is the same which prompted the double definition of words—to confound their meaning and justify the power of the learned to compel the innocence of humanity to serve the passion of greed.

The able writers upon the subject of political economy have battled with words and disputed with each other

until they died disheartened, with a keen sense of the injustice of man toward man. It seems never to have occurred to men who have become eminent in their efforts to assist their fellow men, that words are a product of the learned, and like muskets that will shoot at both ends, words have the same effect when used to compel the tiller of the soil to serve the man who will use the power of his intellect to convince the illiterate that work was man's punishment for not being born with a knowledge of how to avoid it. The assumption of the learned that they possess a right to rule, and, therefore, class themselves as the ruling class, is in conflict with the spirit of popular government, for no man can be taught how to vote, without destroying the virtue of the vote, the same as words which are taught to have double meanings. It is, therefore, when a man has the courage to vote, or exercise his birth right, his sense of existence, that improved systems of government are possible. Thus a revolution of some character will develop a growth of fruit, that will reveal the political duplicity, by which politicians and statesmen attempt to prove that a man is free but his vote belongs to them.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
I. Creation,	9
II. Knowledge,	19
III. Literal Commerce,	34
IV. Education,	47
V. Meaningless Words,	60
VI. Intellect,	70
VII. Society,	80
VIII. Equality,	91
IX. Imagination,	101
X. The Public Schools,	112
XI. Political Deception,	126
XII. Civilization,	137
XIII. Industry,	152
XIV. The Distribution of Wealth,	164
XV. Science-Happiness,	176
XVI. An Ideal Government,	185
XVII. Oppression,	201
XVIII. Religion-Theology,	218
XIX. Liberty and Progress,	233
XX. Summary,	246

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS FROM THE STURDY OAK.

	PAGE.
Afraid to be Honest,	262
A Secret Ballot,	263
Who Does the Ballot Belong to?	266
What is Authority?	269
Political Corruption,	271
Inconsistency,	273
Patience,	273
Respectability,	274
The Confusion of Languages,	275
Was Adam Tempted?	275
Who Believes It?	276
Eternal Force,	277
Does the World Grow Better?	278
Co-Education of the Sexes,	281

A Direct Vote of the People,	284
The Virtue of the Ballot,	286
Do Women Desire to be Exclusive?	288
The Relation of Employer to Employee.	290
Liberty and Politics,	291
False Appearances,	293
What is the Difference?	266
The Moral Law,	297
Mental Growth,	298
The Virtue of Ignorance,	299
The Influence of Money upon the People,	302
Can Morality be Taught?	304
The Divine Right of Kings,	306
The Right of Opinion,	310
Oppression,	313
Public Opinion,	315
The Phenomena of Wonders,	326
Imitations,	329
The Conflict Between Good and Evil,	331
State Management of the School System,	334
Start Right,	337
The Missing Link,	340
Words,	341
The Ballot vs. Money,	342
Ballot Reform,	346
Language,	350
A Defence for the People,	360
Insanity,	368
Natural Rights,	370
The Rights of the Laborer,	375
The Business is Overdone,	377
The Single Tax Agitation,	380
Universal Suffrage,	383
Popular Suffrage,	385
The Social Problem,	386
Personal Importance,	389
The Deception of Voting,	391
The Relation of State to the Individual Man,	393
Words Are Not Language,	396
An American Method of Balloting.	399

CREATION.

CHAPTER I.

All the works of man are subordinate to the one great feature of life. Whatever man may accomplish, or to what extent progress may civilize the people of the earth, or whether happiness, misery, wealth or poverty, become pre-eminent this great feature is changeless. All the ethics, the metaphysics, and the established principles of government, either political or moral, are secondary to this one great feature. It must first exist before it can be disputed. It is the creature of creation, the first known cause, and must be sensed to be known. To comprehend its source would be to supersede itself, and therefore impossible. It is the individual sense of existence, a consciousness of life, a self-revealing force, a knowledge that every form of art is subordinate to.

The effort to protect this consciousness calls into action all the energy which life inspires. Self-love is the first law to command individual obedience. The apparent sacrifice a parent will make for its offspring, proves the power of self-love. The child is a reproduction that excites the greatest degree of happiness, the production of which being the motive that prompts the apparent sacrifice, but in reality is derived from the self-love which is common to all creatures possessing a conscious existence.

The fact that so much doubt exists, and so much speculation in regard to creation has been indulged in, without a universal conviction, proves that no individual

has any advantage in determining a first cause. A literal authority can be established by the numerical force of men who are trained to defend it, but a truth needing a defense will always remain a doubtful one. Literal truth is always related to experience, it is but the sign of the real, as a word is to a fact. Hence a literal question that is doubtful to the individual mind is not an absolute truth until the experience proves it to be such, when it can be seen that the experience is the only real truth. It is only by experience that we comprehend; and literal signs or words must either represent experience direct or be analogous to it.

Man is practically one being in common experience. A common knowledge of literal terms would destroy the incentive to development, it is therefore by a confusion of signs, called language, that an actual comparison of our senses is impossible. This being impossible, how could it be possible for a word to reveal a condition prior to the sense of existence? That is, if a man cannot find a word to convey his sense of feeling, how could a word convey to him a method of creation?

Whatever volume of literal knowledge there may be in regard to a first cause, the revealed truth, the light of life, the individual sense of existence, is the only method by which a literal sign can be discerned. Hence the only known principle beyond a doubt is an individual birth-right. It is equally the right of every creature to determine the source, of which they must be a part, before they can determine anything. The flame or spark of life is in both cases, life. Hence the dependency upon the essential of life, gives no advantage to a degree of life in determining the creation of light. The creation of a spark is no less wonderful than a flame. Besides, if a result of conscious life—literal signs—words—are able to reveal the creation of things, a mother is in debt for existence to her

child, rather than the reverse. It does not change the character of a horse to give it a name, and conception is no less intelligence before a sign of conveyance is established, than afterward.

Now when it is carefully considered that no greater knowledge is possible than that which every degree of information depends upon, the question of creation should be clear. An individual conception of one's self is the only possible knowledge of creation that can be reached, and the fact that this knowledge is but a part of the one known being, the literal conveyance of knowledge is impossible. With this feature in view, even admitting an actual creation, the impossibility of its being revealed to a man who must first possess light enough to comprehend it, must be apparent to all who can feel their own existence. Absolute knowledge is the faculty of perception rather than what is perceived. It therefore follows that the "conveyance of knowledge" is but an exchange of literal signs or words, derived from a knowledge as infinite as endless space.

Speculative philosophy, however skilfully arranged, or to what extent it may be amusing, is dependent upon a fact, from which there is no possibility of establishing a relative word as changeless as the fact. Signs or words must be mutually agreed to before pictures of the mind can be conveyed. It is the privilege of the individual to draw inferences and conclusions from premises which the imaginative character of the mind will permit. Hence it is important to separate the imagery of the mind from fact conceptions before a just conclusion can be reached. The individual character of the mind makes it more important that words and signs, to communicate ideas, should be simple and honest. Pictures, signs, and words are all imagery, either drawn from facts or the transposition of the reflections of facts. While this is simple it is im-

portant to bear in mind the distinct character of the relation of words to facts. Words are but the measures of truths and the least deception in a measure would fail to convey a mutual understanding, when the only value of a word would be destroyed. A creator could not un-create, but words are formed and authorities of definitions established at the pleasure of the mind. Therefore the utmost power of man, is to produce an imagery, which is distinct from creation, because it can be changed to an endless extent. It is impossible to distinguish by literal authority between events of actual occurrence and the imagery of the mind derived from an occurrence. That is, what is myth and what is reality. Yet if this is examined carefully by the individual mind, myth is but the transposition of imagery derived from an actual fact, or creation itself.

The faculty of imagination fails to form pictures that bear no relation to pre-conceived objects. We can rearrange the reflection of an object without disturbing its existence; it would be merely reformed. It is therefore for the individual mind to determine, whether he can reform the reflection of created objects, and hold them to be superior to the eternal existence of things of which he is a part. No mind could conceive of death any more than birth until after such an event was witnessed. To be concise in this matter, can the art of man improve upon universal existence by simply changing the forms of things? What is the spirituality of man if not his sense of existence, his immortality?

Creation and formation are very distinct terms if the former is applied to the genesis or origin of things. The human mind cannot grasp an infinite creation or the beginning of space which has no end. There is no form to sense conception—life—light—feeling—tasting, etc. Therefore, if light was created, it is very improper to apply the word creation to formation. Man can form things

by making literal signs, and other imagery of his sense of existence, but he cannot give to such forms the consciousness of their existence. Hence formation and creation should be distinct terms. The scientific analysis of matter and force is strictly confined to the existence of such elements, and it is equally reasonable to behold eternity in looking backward as forward. Also the fact of conscious existence being possible only by its spontaneous occurrence, does not preclude a mortal existence as much before the form of birth as after the form of death. Both birth and death cannot be considered other than formation, by every individual mind realizing there was a previous conception of life followed by death.

The fact that additional experience is being constantly impressed upon our minds in the same manner as the sense of existence, is no reason that it had no previous existence. All phenomena that man has been able to chronicle, does not establish any principle superior to the light of existence. It shows no condition which would not depend upon an existence no less wonderful than a result. The sense of existence is experience, it is the highest possible form of knowledge. Every degree of information must be secondary. Man can develop in degree only, which is as formation to creation, or the eternity of things, only as he possesses the first principle, a part of eternal existence, and by the evidence of individual experience, surely nothing could take form from it superior to itself.

A flame, or material on fire, may appear to the mind as a scene of grandeur, but it is dwarfed by the phenomenon of fire which exists in the smallest spark.

The source, call it God, Spirit, or whatever you will, the mere term of expression is immaterial to the fact that the source of light, is no truer than the sense of light, is no truer than the sense by which a light is perceived, and

the one is as necessary as the other to complete a perfect being. A life without consciousness may possess elements of unlimited analysis, but the sense of volition is not dependent upon degree. That is, the spirit of animate life, consciousness, possesses no degree superior to self-conception or a sense of one's self. It is important, when literal signs may possess the power of deception to influence a conscious being, to realize the simple fact, that no analysis of an element can ever discover subordinate features of the same, superior to the elements as a whole. Hence every living thing, conscious of its own power of motion is a part of this undefinable element. It would seem therefore, that what no man has ever discovered, is no truer than what he can determine by his individual sense to be true. Hence to act by the knowledge of the truth which possesses no feature of doubt, will fulfill all the obligations of man, while he will be no less a candidate for that of which he may be ignorant, than he was before his birth.

These ideas may be simple, for the principle feature that commends them is their known character to every one who appreciates the individual knowledge of the sense of being. But what one feels himself, he can never be sure that others can as readily understand, for words and signs of expression convey only the imagery of feeling, and however numerous the units of humanity become, every one is alone in his sense conception. To adhere strictly to specific terms and established forms would deprive the individual of the equal right to utter the imagery of thought in form of his own choosing. That is, no one can show a just right to use their individual power to deprive another of the same privileges. The social feature of this principle will be more fully considered in following chapters. Each unit of humanity must discern for himself, for whatever light there may be in the world, no

method is known or recorded, by which established methods analogous to light, will reveal a knowledge superior to that derived from one's own light.

An illustration, perhaps, may give these ideas a little more light. We will suppose a man to be in a dark room in which he had never been before. The room, a museum, filled with the wonders of manufacture, the work of mankind. A man standing in such a room in the dark would be a part of existence as well as the various articles, but in consequence of the darkness he would be ignorant of his surroundings. A light is gradually thrown upon the scene from a mere spark. Thus the man becomes conscious of his surroundings by means of a simple light which is common for a savage, or a common laborer to light his pipe with. Now is there any atom in the room in existence superior or more wonderful than the element of fire, the power of which not only throwing light upon the scene, but revealing to man a power of perception as knowledge to ignorance? Can any one believe that light will ever "go out?" And believing it will exist to all eternity, by what rule can one determine that it was created, that would not also put the light out?

It can therefore be seen by every living creature that possesses the sense of existence, this simple fact: Existence is truth, for it must exist to be true. It cannot reveal a beginning without being present to deny it. Consciousness could exist the same as light and fire is latent in both heat and cold. The absence of utterance would not prove the unconsciousness of any substance. Science discovers what is, rather than what is not, and no one can prove that a flower, or a material atom exists in an unconscious state. That is, all motion could be life, and the very wind but a flock of insects. But speculative ideas are not the purpose of this writing. It is enough to expose the hidden deceit of man which furnishes facts enough, without vaporizing in undiscovered fields.

All the results of science, and established schools of philosophy are pygmies in comparison to the knowledge revealed to the individual mind. It is a light we can neither borrow or lend. It is as sacred enclosed in rags or dirt, as that which reflects but the vanity of the mind, and gives the appearance of being magnificent. Yet it would be a simple matter to reduce a skilfully wrought fabric of art to a dirty powder, that would not make paint enough to satisfy a savage's love for adornment.

Whatever the first cause may be of the wonderful things we see surrounding us, no cause can be possible to the mind of man other than that which his sense of reason depends upon. It is surely the privilege of every individual creature, not excepting the smallest bug, to observe by their own light, that they could not seek in darkness, a light, from which the first spark of knowledge is received.

Liberty is the first impulse of the brain, and if the consciousness of light is the most important factor in the obtaining of knowledge, the sense is an individual conception.

No philosophy is superior to the truth, and no truth can be revealed to man, or a community, that is of more importance than the sense by which it may be determined. Hence, it is the individual privilege to determine for himself, and herein accepted, by proclaiming that the creative cause of all things which can possibly be known, is the inspiration of matter. The science of chemistry reveals a positive action from the bringing together of atoms of substance, which merely takes a new form. Formation, therefore is not definite creation, and the magnitude of the earth with all its movements is only more wonderful in degree, than the friction of a match, which will surround a person with the necessary light to reflect objects to his sense of perception. No analysis can determine original elements beyond the power which is common to all hu-

manity. The taste of sugar can not be analyzed because it has no form, and therefore formation is not creation, whether it be the forming of a planet or the baking of a brick. No one can presume to know more about creation, by reason of a superior knowledge of formation, for the most ignorant mortal that can feel heat, and distinguish it from cold is in possession of a principle superior to all the formation that has ever been wrought. To be more concise: Every living thing in possession of a sense of itself, is thereby in possession of a revealed creation, and as much a part of knowledge and the source of art, as a spark is a part of fire. Degrees of formation add no more to existing principles, than paint is added to by the form it takes in a picture.

The condition of matter and force has no bearing upon the genesis of things, but when form and fact is confounded by defining the word genesis as both origin and formation, substance, appears to be the equal of the form, or condition in which it is in. Force is the authority for formation, and there can be no conception of force and matter without space. Hence, formation of some kind must occur with every motion that force exerts. If there is any authority for the shape of a form the relative character of creation and formation is clear. There could be no origin to a square or circle, yet upon these principles forms are measured. It is not the purpose of this writing to solve the great question of the origin of matter and force, but rather to show how ridiculous it is for any man to attempt to prove a form superior to a fact.

There is no specific form to existence, therefore it could not have been created if by creation we mean formation. The fact that we discover in addition to our own existence, that others existed before us of whom we possessed no knowledge previous to our birth, it betrays the basis of knowledge to rest upon the individual conscious-

ness of existence. That is to say, the discovery that existence in the images of ourselves had a previous existence, shows that every birth is analogous to the mythical story of Adam being the first man upon earth. To believe the earth was ever barren has nothing whatever to do with the relation of existence and form, and when these two principles are comprehended the knowledge of creation is complete.

Thus to the individual mind based upon the real, instead of the highest form of knowledge, the sense of existence, it would seem that no better proof of an eternal existence of any thing could be had, than that we, after becoming conscious of our own presence upon the earth, also discover that all we needed was a light, when an earlier discovery would have been just as possible.


A first cause, or a description of creation, can be seen by the very sense of existence, to be very vague and no less the privilege of one than another to speculate upon. But of one point every one can feel assured, that all any one can see or comprehend, so effectually depends upon their own light, that evil and injustice is as essential as darkness is to light, for light even would be darkness without a counterpart. Therefore, what is right cannot be sensed, until wrong occurs to distinguish it from the monotony of continued sleep, or a continued sense of sweet. Existence is to formation as a straight line is to curves, squares and angles, or as good to evil. That is, the good cannot be sensed prior to the knowledge of evil, and this struggle between evil and good determines the development of character, in proportion to the discarding of the evil as soon as the senses betray it to be such. Existence, therefore, being the fact, or straight line, formation is the alternative, or evil, which causes the action by which the straight course can be chosen.

KNOWLEDGE.

CHAPTER II.

The words sense, conception and knowledge, embrace the same principle — consciousness, a self-revealing force. It is not a gift, but instead it is the Giver. It is God, spirit, soul, it is knowledge. Terms and words are the product, mere imagery as art is to nature. This “something” that is often spoken of as being superior to material things, is sense — knowledge — a consciousness of being. Knowledge is goodness, for it reveals the right and wrong equally, or in just proportion, which throws the responsibility of choice upon the being who is thus forced to exercise his will. A growth and development depends upon a choice which knowledge plainly reveals. It is the authority for every human act, and all other authority is derived from it, and no other than the imagery, or imitation of the real.

The word knowledge is given two meanings in the standard authority, for the purpose it would seem to justify the authority of man, and make his law dictatorial over the supreme law. It matters not how hopeless this assumption of man is, the exercise of defense is as honorable as that of offence, and when we see two forces contending for the right we must recognize the supremacy of knowledge over wrong, as well as right. A growth would be impossible, but for the temptation of knowledge to do wrong. If knowledge revealed only the right, man's growth would be an established fact. His action of will



power would be as motionless as an object without any space to move in. That is, ignorance is necessary as a receptacle for knowledge. Man cannot cover his tracks without using the same power that made them. Hence the last effort he makes to cover them, leaves a mark or track of his efforts. It is precisely this effort that the dictionary betrays. It is filled with the tracks of man's injustice toward man, and the effort to cover this up is the key to disclosing it, the motive is also as plainly revealed.

Facts cannot be beaten down with theories, and if it can be shown that a dictionary of words representing the expression derived from the sense of being, is more important than peaceful society, or simple honesty, this writing is in vain.

The principle of teaching implies a teacher, and to determine a disputed question between what is good teaching and that which is evil, engages the wisdom of the world. Yet the question is as wide open as ever. Governments try to settle this question, and even assume an authority over a man's life by protecting a specific society. Yet governments are proved by history to have been wrong, while individual lives have been taken for opinion's sake, and the opinions adopted by the same government that persecuted the authors.

The great variety of conditions that general society and the subdivisions thereof, are obliged to encounter, surely do not depend upon any particular form of language, or any special authority for the measure of terms. If civilization is desirable and good, it does not depend upon the authority of a falsehood. Therefore, no reason can be shown in justice to humanity, why words with double meanings should be taught to youth unless some motive of injustice is at the bottom of it.

It seems to be a natural law that mankind develops by oppression, but no one can show a right to employ the

literal means of conveying ideas, with a knowledge of injustice toward the illiterate. That is, a knowledge of a wrong toward humanity hidden for the purpose of personal gain, cannot be justified by the seeming necessity of oppression to inspire human progress. The innocent slave cannot be oppressed without revealing a means of escape, and a hidden knowledge of wrong doing will be a greater task master than ever a slave owner was. Hence no one can justify evil by showing an evidence of good results. Real knowledge rules the world as right always prevails over wrong. But the pretended knowledge of what Webster covers by defining it—information—makes a brilliant display, but really endorses the entire wickedness of the world.

When a system of power is maintained by a method of teaching, known by a sincere scholar to be false, it is an effort to place the works of man in authority over his source. The power to do it has become a common excuse, but the power to prevent it is equally justifiable, and the purpose of this writing is, by the aid of this same power, to at least point out the fraud, and encourage the individual to determine for himself what right and wrong is. All creatures are dependent for self-preservation upon their innate power to accept good influence and discard bad influence. Hence, having this power, it is a rebuke to the teacher who would attempt to teach the right, and also be obliged to admit to the scholar the possibility of false teaching, which the scholar must determine for himself. The scholar who knows he must determine for himself could well study the following questions: By what means did you come to that conclusion? If it was taught to you, how do you know it is right? If you answer, by my consciousness I *know* it to be right, it would suggest the question: What particular feature were you taught if only by your own conception you could be sure you were right?

When all the desires, and every reflection of sense in the possession of humanity is twisted and wrapped in every variety of shape to justify the authority of man to teach man, there is a motive carefully hidden. This motive can only be discovered by the sense in proportion to its self-revealing power, in like manner as the mind only can discern between right and wrong, or between good influence and bad. The power of art fails to convey this feature without disclosing its power to deceive. Knowledge, experience pure and simple, is doubtless well understood, for it cannot be taught. It cannot be placed upon paper, for the employment of art makes deception the most attractive in seeming self-defense of the fact that Art is the tempter to inspire a greater love for the real and a consequent growth, which Art will again claim by its special character, and dependent upon the power of deception for its existence. It is the same as a drunken man claiming that his influence was necessary, and he was more virtuous by reason of his example deterring others.

The mind that is taught will strive to imitate its teacher until experience exposes a deception, when it either accepts the deception as preferable, or flees from it and discovers thereby the real secret of development. To justify the principle of teaching it would be necessary to show that it was right, or that the right predominated; and if it was claimed to be only the means necessary to obtaining knowledge, for what purpose were words in the dictionary given meanings that absolutely contradict themselves; and restrain the very purpose for which they are taught?

The reader may say such is not the case, but there are greater difficulties to intellectual development than to prove the dictionary fairly bristles with inconsistencies, for the seeming purpose of keeping humanity in darkness rather than assisting them toward the light. The word

knowledge is given a double meaning and all other words are carefully defined in the support of this fraud. The special character of art is no better displayed in any part of this book than by the definitions given to the word knowledge. The reader should carefully consider this word for it is the key by which the real character of the dictionary may be revealed. Webster defines knowledge as both experience and information. Now if the word knowledge relates to experience, it is very ambiguous to claim that information is also knowledge or experience. The attempt to so define the word, information, is impossible to disguise, for the word volition as an act of the will is a flat contradiction that experience is the same as information.

Information is distinct from volition by reason of the literal imagery of either words or signs being necessary for an intercourse or exchange of mind pictures, but not the thought itself. The employment of art is at the command of knowledge, and not obedient as this effort to define knowledge clearly reveals. Art is but the shadow of knowledge, and the injustice of man toward man is revealed in this recorded effort to control the social relations of mankind by defining the shadow of a man as not only equal, but also in command of the object from which it is cast. The power of art merely affects the intercourse of knowledge, and makes social relations possible. This wise provision, whereby all beings may know each other, is absolutely obedient to knowledge, by reason of its prior existence and always pre-eminently above art. Hence all that can be taught is a method of communication in degree of excellence proportionate to a better understanding of knowledge, which is as infinite as light, and related to the finite character of art as a straight line is to a form.

The motive for this inconsistency should not be considered until we can accept the simple fact that knowledge is not what we see, but instead it is the power to see. What does the word experience suggest to the mind, if not a self-revealing presence irrespective of the presence of any surrounding circumstances? Webster says that information is also knowledge, and then defines the word information as communicating knowledge. This calls for another person or object and the reader can only determine for himself whether sugar communicates taste to the sense, or the discovery of its sweetness is due to the contact with the infinite character of the mind. That is, if sugar communicated taste it could sense its own sweetness and bestow vitality to a stone.

Knowledge derived from a personal presence is very different from information derived from the deceptive character of words, and when an informer seeks to make his words authority over others, he must seek persons of less experience than himself. Thus this word, knowledge, taught to the tender mind of youth as embracing information and experience, he faithfully believes until what experience he is able to straighten up to, betrays the fraud.

Surely the distance to reach an object does not change the character of the object, neither can a confused meaning to words improve their usefulness. Also to assume that words are well known to be relative to experience, and the sense of being, will not excuse the effort to make them so difficult of access. It exposes the hypocrisy of teachers, who would claim to be benefactors of the human race, and also defend the ambiguous definition of words, necessary to make their assumed authority appear just.

The only object for words is to promote intercourse and convey the result of knowledge, which is not increased or diminished by the terms at its command. A line of

specific length will not surround any more space in the form of a square than a circle. To form, to inform, or to reform, expresses the same idea, the mere changing of the object into a different shape, merely deceiving the vision of the mind. A piece of marble ground to a powder and formed into the image of a man will excite a curiosity while the stone in a broken form would have been passed unnoticed.

The relation of information to an actual experience may be seen as follows : If a man should meet another and exclaim, "your father is dead," the man spoken to could form no idea whether the man speaking had observed the event or been informed of it. Without an explanation the son could exclaim to a third man, "I know my father is dead." Now all three men could be equally blameless for speaking as they were taught, yet the fact could have been that the man was not dead, and both methods of expression is justified by the dictionary. That is, the expression, information, can be blended with that of knowledge and destroy the very object of words. It would have been simpler and needed no explanation to have said : "I was informed of my father's death, but having no knowledge of it, I cannot believe it is true." A careful student cannot help seeing how unnecessary the two definitions are to the word knowledge, unless he desires to promote himself at the expense of those he has the power to oppress.

A man keeps a store because he can sell goods, and he therefore becomes anxious to make the goods as necessary as possible. Hence it can be seen that the principle of teaching must be self-protecting. The teacher could not teach an obedience to the principle and also teach that the principle was a fraud. The motive is the governing principle, and because people imitate each other, it does not make a person responsible for his example, or innocently teaching a wrong principle. It should be seen.

therefore, that the motive reveals the knowledge of right and wrong.

The individual teacher is responsible for his teaching at the point where he seeks to disguise his motive. The mere resting upon the confidence of another, and transmitting literal signs and the imagery of words upon the authority of information, and a belief that it conveys knowledge, is to be thoroughly deceived by art and ignorant of the revealing power of real knowledge. The devil will change his form to suit, so long as he can prevent a man from a self-dependence, that pure knowledge — experience — will reveal.

Whatever is taught either by natural influence or the power that one man can exercise over another, the conscience only can determine whether it is right or wrong. To stifle the understanding and prevent a consciousness of wrong, would make a person irresponsible for their actions. Thus in whatever way one turns the subject the individual conscience stands out as the only means of determining the right from the wrong. Surely no sincere person could defend a system however ancient that would uphold and declare it to be right, to cripple the minds of ninety-nine persons to maintain the exclusive elevation of one.

The popular belief in the virtue of teaching is the result of the system itself, and the person who becomes prejudiced by what was taught to him is like the crooked tree, that will retain all its crooks until it falls down to nourish a reproduction, which will develop into a straight tree. Hence if this subject is examined carefully, the person willing to accept such truth as his own sense of existence establishes in his mind, must see, or deny his own existence, that the motive in giving words double meanings was more to keep him down than to assist him up.

The power that man derives his authority from is simply the knowledge of how to do it. Power is power whether it strikes the right or wrong, it is as absolute as light. The instinct of strife in human nature is a power as essential to active existence as sunlight. Man's effort to crush and subjugate others is derived from the constant agitation of material existence. But do these facts justify a systematic effort to overcome the natural order of things, simply because a man knows how to deceive by teaching that submission is a virtue, and resisting a crime.

The terms moral right and legal right are as confusing as the words experience and information. Now to be, and not to be, is an absolute contradiction of terms. No man can define a legal right if terms were properly defined, for a name will never change the object. No power of man can make a right, hence to call an act of man a legal right is known to be a moral wrong by the only method that a right can be determined—the individual sense of existence. The individual consciousness of a wrong can never be changed by all the “legal rights” that were ever enacted. Thus from the definition applied to words is the power derived by which man can justify the oppression of his brother, who may be naturally ignorant of the means of defence, and equally so when he is taught that a word which represents a reality when applied to a vision, makes the vision a reality also.

It will doubtless be difficult to comprehend these principles from the very fact that no honest standard of a comprehensive language was ever written, a uniform measure of words is the very first step toward a mutual understanding, and as the principal effort of Webster was to have all the words support each other, it appears to have been immaterial what relation they bore to facts. A prejudiced mind will not guide a man straight any more than two lines can ever meet after starting from a given

point and slightly diverging from each other ; and if evil is justified in the product of a good result one should first examine for himself to determine whether the evil did not cause more distress, than the good caused happiness. The law that a few should yield for the benefit of the many, would, if reversed, show the absolute nature of things, which is to show the right by a source of pleasure in doing right, against that of pain and the vision of destruction which accompanies wrong doing. Also if Nature did not protect by an absolute law entirely unapproachable by the legal enactments of man, such enactments would grind the human family into the earth, for, without the protection of Nature by a desire for society, as soon as two living creatures saw each other they would fight until one or both were dead.

The folly of teaching people that they must be taught what is right or wrong is confused by the definition of words, for the same sense is called into action to be taught the right, that is acted upon by natural inspiration in teaching the same thing. It must therefore be apparent that a measure cannot contain more than its own dimensions, or that a method of human iniquity in teaching what was right was superior to the method that inspired a sense of pleasure in the act of doing right.

If the wonders of civilization are due to the privilege of teaching and even compelling children to be taught, it is equivalent to parading the works of man to be superior to that from which he derives the power to work. Some sense must be appealed to before teaching is possible, a desire to learn suggests no idea of the knowledge to be obtained. Hence, deception is the primitive step toward teaching a child, for its confidence must first be secured before it will change its own course of observation. This shows plainly that natural protection against deceit ceases, when the sense of effects between the parent and child is so

mutually blended as to partake of pleasure and pain in whichever mind it may occur.

The pomposity in man is displayed in his effort to show the kindness that men bestow upon each other. He will make any excuse, and claim all the events of the world to be due to his particular school of discipline. He holds a dialogue with himself, he shows what would have been if he had died with the measles, he contends that he knows exactly what will be, and besides, he declares that whoever was taught in a different school than he was, is ignorant of what is right. If he believes all this, it is because his school tied him so tight that he is ignorant of everything beyond the length of his rope. If he does not believe it, he knows he is deceiving others for the purpose of being served by them. There can be no shuffling off of responsibility after the knowledge of them is once obtained for this is man's privilege to confess to himself regardless of all that was taught him. The hanging on to a string of flattery is simply serving what is attached to the other end of the string. Such persons have not developed sufficiently to be responsible for their weakness, and their feelings will never be hurt by this writing, for if they could comprehend it they would not be lead by any mind weaker than their own.

The sense of sympathy will sustain an evil doer. A man will enter heartily into a method of deception to gratify his sense of vanity, but the sympathizing power of this condition depends upon his associates; for a deceptive man, however brilliant or respectable he may appear, will be an object of pity if left alone to sustain himself. Man cannot be taught anything superior to that which deals direct with his own conscience, and when that is clear, he will stand alone in defiance of the whole world.

A desire to communicate with each other is the incentive of language, It is no more strange that some

formulas would be adopted to convey our feelings than that a hen would cluck to her chickens, but unlike the hen with her limited degree of knowledge, man makes the boast that he can reason. He proves it by his power of deception, and ability to arrange formulas, that doubtless sprung from crude sounds, with double meanings, for the purpose it would seem to destroy their object wholly. What man builds is no more wonderful than a spider's web, but because he is powerful enough to brush a frail web away and crush the spider with a contemptuous sneer, he tries to assume authority over his own conscience. When this fails, he discovers he can teach some, and compel others, to be obedient. Everything within man's reach is thus made to serve him, and the wonder of man is his ability to deceive his own kind.

The principle of teaching is derived from the desire to learn, and the deceptive character of man finds the means to make slaves obedient without the trouble of standing over them with a whip. He engrafts into the mind of youth the dogma of quality among human beings, and as it is taught, it would seem that the quality was exhausted in proportion to their ability to deceive their fellow-men. Man points with one hand to the wonders of science, the railroads, the massive buildings, the artistic upholstery, with pride, but if he raises his other hand it will point to poverty, misery and distress. Surely we have to pay dear for belonging to a race that possesses such a power, that they can deceive each other, and teach obedience to the laborer, who after the mansion is built, will be turned out of its doors and admonished that he is poor because he was wicked. Thus implying that there was more virtue in an appearance than what was absolutely real.

It is so easy to be deceived when a motive is thoroughly disguised, that self-reliance is the main dependence to those who are sincere in seeking the truth. By the

same method of reasoning faults are imagined to exist in others, because one's own great fault is their dependence upon a specific method of teaching, which appeals to the vain sense of man rather than the sense of his experience. Thus words are applied to a real object that the individual sense can comprehend, and then they are also used to repaint an object that is not real, but made to appear so because it bears the same name as the real. For instance, sugar is sweet, the absolute sense of which can only be known by the sense of taste. The word sweet is applied to specify such taste, and whatever the word is applied to, conveys to the mind a comparison to the taste of sweet. Hence when we learn that sugar is sweet by the taste of it, it is natural to conclude that whatever is called sugar is sweet whether we verify it by the taste or not. Now if any one could explain why a handful of sand so white as to resemble sugar should not be called sugar, the same reason would apply to the word knowledge after being used to express a true sense, why it should not be applied to a mere information, which could only be proved by the sense of vision in the same manner as sugar can only be known by the taste.

It is not expected that this writing will convince a person who is already convinced that the only method to reach an object is to follow in the same path he was taught to go in. Such persons are not only taught to go in the path, but they are taught it is right to sneer and abuse whoever is unwilling to be whipped into the same line. A man who is thoroughly taught, however, may be sincere, but because he is made a dupe of to serve an object that his senses of experience never encountered, it is no reason why others should be compelled to keep silent, after they had learned by experience that the principle of teaching was to protect the exclusive control of the knowing ones of society, so they could be served by the victims that are trained into obedience.

A fact must first appear before its necessity becomes apparent, hence it is a common excuse that a method is wrong because it was never tried. By the same rule a boy will never fail until after he is born. Hence, teaching must necessarily depend upon what has occurred, while learning depends upon what the sense of experience encounters, and for all the systems of the past to undertake to prove a sense of experience to be incorrect, is as futile, as to convince a man he is unconscious of his existence, when he knows enough to go around a post rather than attempt to go straight through it.

It is no doubt clear to such scholars who possess a motive and feel obliged to disguise it, that ignorant people are imposed upon simply because they are ignorant of the means of defence. The man who is tied to his limited surrounding is not always ignorant of the effect himself, but in the dilemma he finds himself placed, he tries to choose the lesser evil, and if any merit could be applied to the principle of teaching, it is only when the deception surrounding the truth is taught, and a square acknowledgment of a free expression of opinion.

The supposition that civilization and progress is due to book education is very misleading, for a priority must exist before a condition of progress can make even a start. Hence, liberty is the very first impression that is flashed upon the brain, it is the instinct of power that the light of existence enables a being to appropriate. It is superior to any condition that could result from the principle of teaching, if all the development of the world could be packed into one brain. Therefore it is the liberty to learn rather than the principle of teaching that civilizes the earth, and nothing can develop that is superior to that from which it developed. The motive therefore in giving double meaning, to words is covered by a flimsy disguise, no doubt well known to scholars, who for reasons best

known to themselves choose to remain silent, To be plain, the motive is precisely this: Man endeavors to control his own source by charging the wickedness of the world to Nature, to hide the deception of art.

Man assumes that his intelligence is controlled by some element outside of the senses, or that Nature is subordinate to its form. He therefore, endeavors to make the words information and experience appear to be of equal significance to the simple word sense. Hence the word knowledge is defined to embrace them both. Every one has the proof of this for himself, for it cannot be proved by any authority that is dependent upon a reflection of the real, for shadows reflect shadows only to reveal the common likeness of humanity.

Surely if evil must be maintained to preserve the right of choice, there is no method more convincing than experience. If confidence in others must take precedence over individual reason, that which the precepts of teaching, teaches, would be destroyed by making the individual irresponsible from his being compelled to be taught, and therefore in justice the teacher should be more severely punished than the taught.

LITERAL COMMERCE.

CHAPTER III.

The imagery of the mind is thought, and the desire for intercourse is the basis of words. There is no specific character to language. Its origin, often spoken of is as unknown as the sense of taste; it is embraced in the senses, and is as infinite as eternity. The word "expression," is more fitting to convey a correct idea of literal commerce than language, for words, forms, and variations of sound are designated as different languages, when there is but one principle by which mind pictures can be conveyed.

Every method by which the imagery of one mind is conveyed to another depends upon a mutual conception, which is only determined by the power of the mind to utter sounds to represent forms, and then reverse the power by making forms to stand for specific sounds. The study of philology and syntax may be carried to unlimited extravagance, yet the simple principle of expression is ever the same, and sugar is no sweeter whether the expression derived from its taste is written in Greek, Latin, or English.

The most learned class, as a rule, have been the masters of humanity. They at least have been the controlling power of nations, by reason of their literal knowledge. They have also justified the ownership of man by man, or to hold their own likeness as property. Hence, whatever can be said in support of this crime, or the individual effort in behalf of the oppressed, the fact remains that the learned as a class have always been the oppressors of humanity. To claim credit for redeeming men and women

from the slough of despair, is to face the unanswerable records of the past, which makes the learned class more responsible for chattel slavery because their own claim of a right to rule by the power to rule, gave them also the power to prevent it. What reason can anyone show that the learned of the present have any less of the spirit of "master," than the learned of the past? Can a man justify himself in oppressing his fellowmen in a different *form*, simply because he abhors the more ancient method?

Humanity is not in debt to the literally learned for their improved condition, and the attempt is herein made to show that the extravagance in literal terms of expression have been formulated with oppression more in view, than any disposition to benefit the human race. As if any particular formula of expression, changed the virtue of a sense of conception, the common property of all.

After creation or birth the most important consideration is words or signs, to compare the imagery of the mind which has been shown to be the essential feature of life. Happiness is thus promoted in a state of society, which is an obvious necessity beyond the power of man to prevent. Hence words are the measures of expressions and bear the same relation to mind pictures, or thought, as a yard stick to the cloth it measures.

A dictionary possesses no authority other than a natural acceptance of a definite standard, to preserve a uniform measure for words. Men who will enslave their kind, and seek to withhold the means of literal intercourse to make the bonds more secure, would also seek to monopolize every method of speech that is invented. The dictionary, therefore, is *the book* to study, for it will disclose more deception disguised as virtue than any other book. It undertakes to define words so they will mean as much as the reality of things. It simply tries to make the authority of man equal to conception. It justifies the

"divine right of kings," and the definition to words are wholly in the interest of the class division of humanity. It is wholly incompatible with American ideas of popular government. It is a stupendous fraud and condemns itself by the very care in which words relating to man's authority over his kind are given both a positive and negative meaning. If it is possible for a scholar to be ignorant of this, he is innocent, but to know it and keep silent, he is a party to the fraud.

To properly consider the book a man should first study himself, and settle the question in his own mind whether the knowledge of himself was not of more value than that which he received from others in the form of words. Knowledge antedates the dictionary, which is the work of man, it cannot therefore be the authority for knowledge, or be able to define the word, other than to show a form by which specific objects which are changeless may be compared. No one can understand this writing who is confined to the diction of that which is the result of man. One must imagine himself outside of a dictionary, for words cannot convey knowledge. That is, if we consider knowledge as shapeless as the sense of taste, the impossibility of conveying it, which introduces a form, must be apparent.

The usefulness, however, of the dictionary as a principle is unquestioned, but it being the work of man it must necessarily possess the character of his work, which being formed can always be measured, and therefore a distinctive barrier exists between that which can be formed and that which is shapeless, unchangeable, and to the conception of man, eternal, or infinite. Man's inheritance is sense, a power of self-identity, his ability to act or move, to form things, and while he is both free and responsible, he can act in such form as he chooses. His choice being governed by his sense of right or wrong, which is innate in

all creatures of life which are able to defend themselves or flee from the approach of danger. Thus the dictionary is merely a measure of literal form, and fallible because of the impossibility of form being able to measure the infinite or eternal sense of being.

An absolute literalist is hopelessly confined to that which man has previously accomplished, and however brilliant one may become, the influence of forms will control the mind until the natural faculty perceives its own ability to form ideas of its own. A person can doubtless be happy in exhibiting the product of others, and also feel it to be a duty to teach others to follow his example, but no one, after conceiving himself, can hold that a literal conveyance is equal to the inspiration of the mind. That is, that a form of expression from another is superior to the volatile action of the mind which suggests the imagery that the lines of form, or variation of sound, merely imitates as a painted picture imitates the object. It must reveal to the sincere mind the source from which all literal forms have sprung.

When it is considered that two persons cannot think alike, see alike, or act alike, the absolute relation of man's mind to himself is obvious. To express the term, "we think alike" conveys a meaningless idea. No two can compare their thoughts by the mere expressions, for the simple reason that one can express the reverse of what he thinks. One can form imagery in the mind and literal forms can be conveyed, which are derived from their pictures, but the same faculty of forming imagery will permit of a wrong impression, and it does not follow that the influence of one mind upon another produces duplicate imagery, because the same literal expression is employed. Hence it can be seen that when we desire the truth, we can only obtain it by the sacredness of the individual conscience, by which we determine the thoughts of others by studying cause and effect acting upon ourselves.

Words therefore are always fallible and powerless to convey absolute truth, or absolute knowledge. To determine this principle the infallible sense of being must be employed. These very words are but signs, or measures, which are derived from the sense of being, and therefore fallible in the sense that the interpretation also would be fallible. If this principle was carefully considered by even a prejudiced mind, its fairness at least, must be admitted. It also leads to the thoughts, the expression of which prompts the formation of these lines. Thus the manner, method, or form is secondary to mutual understanding, and words are blanks to all persons who have no pre-arranged method of forms related to the senses.

A man with a prejudiced opinion is as much limited to his condition, as one unborn. The darkness in which he is surrounded makes him unconscious of it. No one could receive any "light" who was unconscious of darkness, and having sufficient light to distinguish darkness, one has no need for that which must first exist before the necessity could be felt. The knowledge of forms by mutual agreement does not preserve any specific imagery of the mind, for such forms are only suggested after the mind pictures are formed. Mind development is derived from the effort to convey that which it is spontaneously endowed with. Every effort reveals the necessity for another, and the mind is illuminated by a reciprocal exchange of thought expression. Hence the commerce in ideas have a mutual effect to stimulate growth, in proportion to literal forms being justly applied to the same sensation. That is, words cannot establish imagery, for every literal form, either a modern mark or sound, is the outcome of imagery and not the mother of it.

The term "true form" is a contradiction. That is, it misapplies the word, true, for a seeming effort to give to words, manners, and methods, a power equal to the sense

conception from which they are derived. A "correct form" would express the mathematical square or circle, but to apply the word, true, to metaphysics, and also to mathematics is to confound the unmeasurable sense of being because it has no form, with characters which can be measured by reason of their form. Let us consider farther: How can a square and circle both be true when they represent two different forms? How can two distinct forms be true? The word, different, betrays that if either a square or circle was a true form the other would be false. The only possible sign for the truth is a straight line. It is the point where the metaphysical and mathematical meet. A square is a form, it can be mathematically correct yet metaphysically untrue, because the straight line has taken form. Hence the words, true, and form, are as Nature to art, are as right and wrong, are as good to evil, and deified by the term God and devil. It can also be compared to material and its impelling force, by which motion is established. It is also well to observe how impossible motion would be if material had no space to move in. The movement makes space essential, and art is as equally essential to life and growth.

The relation therefore of art to Nature should be clear to the self-revealing power of the mind. It is self-evident. Also the necessity of acting wrong is as positive as the action itself, and the only possible method by which the right is revealed. Because this principle cannot be conveyed in literal terms the value of life appears. That is, we are naturally good and artfully wicked, and intellectual growth depends upon the courage to taste the unknown and avoid a repetition of every act, which is discovered to be wrong. It must also be apparent how impossible it is to utter "true words" without admitting human authority, and the very foundation of property in man, or a justification of the authority of the learned

over the unlearned. Now, as the sensing of a wrong act is the only method by which the right is discovered, it is impossible for a man to be in possession of a knowledge of literal forms and also be innocent of committing a wrong. As before stated, the right is in ceasing to respect acts that are known to be wrong, and all people who mutually agree upon their forms of expression cannot hide from each other their wrong acts. It is only toward those, over whom the whip of authority can be applied, that any degree of deception is possible.

The only appeal that one intelligent man can make to another is to cease doing that which his own conscience tells him is wrong. Persecution for opinions, will arise in some form from any appeal to the man who seeks to hide his wickedness and profit by his power to deceive the ignorant. That is, a man never persecutes another for the benefit of a people over which he claims authority; it is from the effort to disguise his own wickedness. Also the effort to appear happy only deceives the ignorant, for to the intelligent the effort betrays the deceit. The dilemma of the learned in literal forms, is to show a consistent regard for the improvement of their fellowmen, and also strive to protect a deceptive measure of language which was undoubtedly fixed to justify human slavery. Will a man if he is sincere in proclaiming to quench the thirst of his brother, carry water to him in a sieve? Will he pretend to carry words of cheer to another and also defend what he knows to be a fraud? Will he pretend that knowledge has authority over ignorance, and also that the ignorant man should not only serve the man of knowledge, but be punished also for an obedience if the act was wrong? That is, it is logically inconsistent to hold a man to be responsible for his will power, and also to an obedience to authority formulated in the mind of another. The individual choice of mind is to obey its own will, or the author-

ity of others. One is right and the other is wrong, and who can tell which except the individual in possession.

The terms truth and form can readily be seen to be uncongenial, and the word truth is as unmeasurable as a continuous straight line. There is no word in the English language more important to a correct conveyance of ideas. The principle of truth is too sacred to admit of mathematical proof. A relative word to represent it, can get no nearer than a picture to its object, or a shadow cast by obstructing the light. If this word truth is applied to a variety of conditions, confusion of tongue, is even worse confounded. We often hear such contrary expressions as "true word," "true shape," and "literally true." Such expressions merely betray the vanity of man in assuming authority by making his own work—imagery—to appear to the unexperienced mind to be the equal of the real. This deception is only possible in the absence of experience, which is the only method of proving a word, and just as surely disproves the authority of man over man. Therefore the word, experience, commands more respect than the word, truth, as commonly used. For instance, one can say: "It is my experience," and who does not understand that expression better than to say: "It is true." A picture is spoken of as being true, but the only truth that could be applied to it, if the word was what it stood for, would make the picture false.

Webster's definition to the word, truth, is as follows: "Real state of things, reality, an established principle." Now it may be seen that reality is a good definition of sense existence, as well as truth which also represents it; it is also a principle so well *established*, that the definition, an "established principle" betrays an unnecessary, or hidden meaning. If the truth is a reality, and "real state of things," it is not as subordinate as "established principles," which the definition of establish, by the same

authority, will fully sustain. To establish is a production, some effect of motion, something made, but reality is not made. Consciousness must always precede the necessary act to *make* or establish anything. Established principles cannot be as impervious to a change as reality or actual sensation, to which the word, truth, is equally applied. The act of man stands between reality and established principles, over which his will presides. That is, he builds up and tears down, hence it would seem that a motive, closely akin to the principle of property in man, was behind this effort to give words double meanings.

It would add to the wide field of study, for the student seeking the truth and "real state of things," to investigate the "established principles" by which words are defined, more to protect the love of authority in man, than to teach the truth. No man can be consistent who guards his own interest at the expence of being dishonest. He may devote himself to charity to others, but his example of deceit will do more wrong, than his appearance of honesty will make right.

Surely the principle of truth cannot be both true and false, and if the established law of man to protect social relations can be clothed in truth by a word of definition to deceive the ignorant, it can be easily shown. Every one who studies history knows that systems and principles are established, and re-established by the will, or the power to control the will by the whip of authority over the timidity of ignorance. Hence an elastic principle cannot be such truth as the senses, or experience reveals, that which is eternal by reason of the necessity of employing the existence of things in the attempt to prove a period of non-existence, which in real truth proves eternity.

To follow this idea a little farther it may throw a different light upon the important principle of truth, which every feature of civilization rests upon. Words necessarily

lean upon each other, and are therefore fallible, but the truth is self-revealing and is best known by its ability to exist unsupported. It may be seen that a "made truth" and a revealed truth, are as a picture to a fact which is fully explained in the previous chapter on creation. A void, even, could be no less true than a creature of creation, and we should recognize that knowledge is to ignorance what space is to matter. That is, no one could learn without being ignorant, neither could material things move without space to move in, also truth or the right needs the wrong before revelation can occur. That is, a wrong must exist for the right to be revealed to, as much so as black is necessary before white will make a revealed mark.

The compiling of words into a form of authority has been the means of introducing a system of literature. It is the outcome of the natural desire for society, and the common impulse to express our feelings. Authority for such words is as various as the words themselves. Words cannot reveal anything until sensation occurs, therefore words are never revealed, for their only use is to convey a picture of revelation, which is as a shadow to its object. The fallibility of words is doubtless well known to the average scholar, and he must if consistent, admit that it is not right to assume an authority to teach the ignorant and also hold that such persons are the common prey of deceit until they learn by the sense of experience, which is a revelation, when man's authority is seen as the shadow of the real object. Surely if we should conclude that we possessed no sense of duty other than what is conferred by the influence of others, this question would arise: From whence was the *sense* derived to form such a conclusion?

Words are as necessary to mind development as exercise to the muscles. Growth is no less than matter in motion impelled by the self-revealing power of the mind. We can observe motion only as we possess, or become a

part of it. It would seem idle therefore to seek beyond the power to seek. A jack-knife cannot whittle itself regardless of its power to whittle everything else into the proper shape. Human knowledge is either experience or analogous to it. Therefore as all words are related to each other, their utility as a method of human growth depends upon a definition for the mutual benefit of humanity. Intercourse, growth, education, are identical terms wholly dependent upon motion. Hence the commerce of ideas, and the commerce of merchandise are always in unison. Obstacles and temptation excite ambition, which is no less than a continual want, and if the deceit in the definition of words can be justified, it must be upon the ground that it excites the ambition to discover the fraud.

The dictionary should be as impartial toward humanity as the power of man could make it. It should not protect the power of offence by striving to make defense impossible. The book bears witness against itself and it is doubtless well known to the scholar, but who can attach a moral value to knowledge and also seek to hide from the illiterate how simple literal commerce really is? How can ignorance be proved a crime if knowledge depends upon the pretence of teaching morality, and at the same time be obliged, for self-protection, to hide its own deceit? If the division of humanity is right, it would not be necessary to maintain a wrong to protect it. It is only the knowledge of doing wrong that suggests a method to hide it, and knowledge would be weary of being served if in good faith it sought to enlighten its servants.

Let us understand each other, for such is the very object of words. Sensation is a "real state of things," if the word truth relates to sensation, it is subordinate, it should not declare itself the equal of its object by assuming that the effect of sensation was also true, for it is well known that right and wrong both, are factors in human

affairs, it is therefore wrong to use a sign or word to represent an object and its shadow also. A man and his shadow does not make two men, which would be parallel to sensation and the result of sensation being termed two truths. One is real and the other is established. Look at the absurdity of using the word, true, to represent a duplicate. The expression "true to a pattern" is in common use, and there are no doubt men who would defend such an expression from their being so firmly wedded to a dictionary. Are patterns themselves true, is the first to be considered? If a duplicate of an incorrect form is true, surely one should honor the wrong as a model for the right to copy.

If truth can be made, changed, added to, or taken from, the element of sensation should never be embraced with the works of man. The word to express it should be distinct, and never employed to give the appearance of equality between a real object and man's attempt to imitate it. A lie can be duplicated, and Webster would have called it a true lie by the same rule he defines the word true. Therefore the original is not questioned if the numerous duplicates taken from a fraud are all of the same pattern.

This subject is dwelt upon for the purpose of impressing the mind of the reader, with the importance of a real standard for the definition of words to rest upon, and upon what base can man rest his knowledge that will stand any better, than his sense of existence, the light of eternity, what every individual can determine, even if all others dispute it. It is not imagined that mankind do not know what truth is, or what is right or wrong, but to the contrary, the effort is made to show how impossible it is to convey what is right, when a sense of wrong must first occur by the act, before a comparison existed necessary to the conveyance of an idea.

Words in no sense effect a changeless truth, it is only the possible development of man that is effected by extravagant methods of conveying ideas. The more simple the definition of words were, the more mutual would be the understanding. No one can reasonably dispute that literal commerce promotes a higher state of civilization, and it as surely follows that the right of expression is more fully recognized. Is it more important, therefore, to protect the double meanings of words than the social relations of humanity? Is it not clear that the learned men are responsible for literal terms? What excuse can they give for assuming the charge of the means of conveying ideas, and also seek to hide the duplicity in words in justification of the errors of the past? Are not words as much for the benefit of the whole race, as for those who elect themselves to exclusive privileges, and use their knowledge to defend the use of words with a positive and negative meaning?

EDUCATION.

CHAPTER IV.

Education, pure and simple, is growth, expansion, the birth of ideas, a result of the natural desire to grow or learn. Man is not in debt to his surroundings, for his mind is volatile and self-revealing, in proportion to a choice between what it knows to be right or wrong. The right cannot be literally expressed, and no necessity exists for such expression, for every conscious being must suffer the consequences of its own digression. Hence, the mind itself is the only source to determine right, or the responsibility for doing wrong would be a self-evident injustice. We cannot bear the burdens of others, for the simple reason that we *know* how incapable we are to throw them off. Hence, if we cannot throw off our own, it is simple logic to see it is the merest pretence to assume to bear the burdens of others. We cannot *learn* others; we can only teach them by example and relative imagery.

It can be seen that the word, education, is defined by Webster to disguise the authority in man, over man. It endeavors to cover the traditional dogma that education is dependent upon teaching; it hides the natural desire of the mind to seek information. It deceives the innocence of childhood, and assumes that knowledge is communicated and expressed in literal form. It is the assumption of a priority of form to the fact which must previously exist. It assumes that the form of an object is superior to the object itself. It disguises the well known character of art,

which experience alone reveals. It shows the necessity of art to justify the pretence of man's authority over his own kind.

What is the object of education? There are as many as there are methods of educating. The human mind could not possess the power of development without it being pliable, and this fact makes it possible to be guided by outside influence. It is, therefore, no secret that the mind of a child may be warped into whatever shape a designing person may choose, and the child is helpless to resist its surroundings, prior to an experience of effects. It is clearly obvious that literal education is embraced in the power of man to oppress, or enslave his kind. Literal authority does not show a generous spirit, when the service of slaves was justified upon the ground of their ignorance of defence. The motive of slavery is as clear as the fact of its civilizing influence, for slave masters betrayed it in their effort to retain their slaves. Besides, it is liberty that shows progress more than the chains of slaves.

Education, in the form of instruction, is to promote mutual understanding, or to provide the means to compare the reflections of our experience and preserve a record of them. The common desire to learn makes it possible to impose upon each other, and nothing more surely proves the necessity of self-reliance than the known power in man, to deceive under cover of the pretence of rendering an assistance. Hence, the pure principle of education, like all facts worthy of an undefiled term to represent them, are corrupted to satisfy the greed of man, and love of authority. This disposition in man, being equally prominent with the desire to push forward, makes the term, justice, apply to power as well as reason. It seems to justify the wrong doer, when he can employ the power to accomplish an object, and also proclaim it to be right by the same means. The power to establish an authority, is

equally powerful to protect it, and also persecute or punish who ever dares to doubt the right of such authority. But man has no method of comprehension in the absence of his senses, and whenever he is taught an obedience, which his senses reveal to be wrong, he knows the authority is wrong, even if he must submit to its power. Why such a condition is possible, is simple, as revealed to the mind by its own volatile power, and the impossibility of perfect literal expression, will in no sense change the condition. If this would seem to justify an authority to dictate forms of expression, it could also be seen it would produce a dead race, by reason of its perfection.

The development of a man is as uncertain as a flower that springs from the earth. It is the very obstacles he encounters that suggests the means of overcoming them, but if he justify himself in obstructing his brother, whom he pretends to assist, his sense will admonish him in proportion to the motive. If human beings were compelled to be honest by a positive authority of ethics, which depended upon being taught, the teacher destroys the system by protecting himself from objectionable toil, by his knowledge of deception. That is, if teachers cannot hide their disposition to profit by wrong acts, their example will contradict the best system of ethics that could be established.

The principle of teaching is derived from human bondage. Such terms as master, slave, and servant, with their various applications, betray the motive of all rulers and literal methods, which are established by man. The faculty of reason to a man in a position of authority, is always used to protect the position. If he feels it to be false, he employs his entire mental faculty to show the necessity of obedience, and his passion will expand to malice if his freedom to deceive others is disturbed. He will also claim that his interests should be protected, by

treating it as a crime to instruct his dupes in methods of defense. His obligations, his vanity, his position in society, his claim to exerting a moral influence, will overpersuade him against the sense of his dishonesty. An external appearance may reflect a serene interior, but the man who can sense his existence, is also conscious of his honesty or dishonesty, without any method of teaching him how to discover it.

A conflict being necessary to establish activity, the element we term, reason, is in constant strife with the physical form of man. Reason, is no less than active sense, and if education or growth has any effect upon this element, we are immediately met with the fact that false teaching is as readily absorbed as good. Hence, the relative action of reason, to determine right and wrong, elevates its subjects in proportion to its own height. A peculiar faculty of reason, prevents absolute destruction from a disposition to laziness, which the luxuries of life are constantly counteracting. No sooner does a man become prosperous and receive a little popular attention, than the devil takes him on wings of imagination into a high mountain, from whence he is offered the whole world, but if his reason is his authority, he will accept the lesser quantity, and really get more.

Webster's definition of the word, education, is worthy the attention of every sincere scholar who inherits the spirit of existence, from which source only is he able to think, or be taught even what to think. A careful observer may detect the effort to confound this word by its variety of meanings. Thus, by a careful study, the same motive may be discerned, that prompted the confusion of other words. This uniformity betrays a purpose of deception, and if the very standard of authority for correct language was tampered with in the interest of an exclusive class of society, surely, the hope of humanity, by being cultivated upon a false basis, will result in a dream.

People who are "educated," would no doubt exclaim at once, that they knew exactly what the word means, and some would no doubt add that only the "educated" could define it. But facts are never created, made, or *established*, by simply placing a particular mark upon an element of existence. Now, the word, education, as defined, would not mean anything by reason of being applied to a fact, and also to an established principle, which depended for its existence upon the power of man to protect it. A person may understand what it is to receive knowledge—no more or less than a new birth—and yet to make the word, education, consistent with its definitions, is impossible.

It may therefore, be seen, that when the word, education, is used, and the mind from which it emanates desires to convey a particular meaning, the mind receiving the expression, can, with the same confidence, receive it, and apply another meaning; practically making the word meaningless, and much worse, because both minds would be deceived. As the word stands now, the expression: "He is not educated," could be made by one man who felt so himself by reason of his being taught, while the man spoken of may have discovered a new principle never recorded in words, from which would be engrafted a method taught to future generations, and not till then would it become knowledge, according to the first man. Besides, the discoverer not being able to answer to all that the definitions to the word, education, required, he would be branded, "uneducated," while his discovery of which he must have possessed *knowledge*, was *taught* to others and called education.

This injustice is doubtless well known to those who are "educated," but only by the greatest effort could the foundation be disturbed upon which the exclusive class of society depend. Hence, no writer can reasonably expect any assistance from those who know, for their own position

depends upon their power to protect the deception of the dictionary, and any man who will willfully do wrong, will, from the same spirit, seek to protect it, making it appear also, that only such as follow his example do right.

No enemy would loan ammunition to its adversary. It would, however, recommend the kind it would prefer to receive from the muzzles of the guns. Hence, the only possible method by which this deception can be thoroughly exposed, is to examine this matter individually, for it will never be taught, which implies force, it can only be learned, which is practically a new birth derived from the desire to learn. It is the individual privilege which is nourished to its own destruction, by a system of education, for which the dictionary was purposely fixed.

The outcry of realism can be made to appear ridiculous by the authority of words, if such an authority was absolute, but what is realism, if not a defense of the real? The real needs no defence, it will not even permit of defence, for it is not real if it needs to be established or defended by the power of man, for the very presence of such power would imply its necessity to sustain a reality—a truth—something which could not be destroyed—then what need would it have for defense?

It is perfectly clear that the dictionary is established, and it is very important to the present theory, by which aristocracy and plutocracy are justified. A fact is not established, according to Webster, for an establishment needs defence, and thus admitting a danger of destruction. Surely no one would claim that a fact could be other than disclosed or discovered. This merely shows that to establish a system of education, the power of man must defend it, and the dictionary being established also, it is to make it appear that a representation is equal to what it represents, and from imaginary premises, anything can be proved to be a fact regardless of what it is. It could also

prove existence to be a mere imagination.

Words are but the coin by which intelligence is conveyed, they do not create intelligence, any more than a dollar creates the corn it will buy, and in addition, for a man to claim that because a dollar bought the corn, it civilized the man by *permitting* him to work. Words could not convey intelligence if there were none, neither could gold buy corn, but it would have no effect upon corn in the absence of gold, neither would the absence of words destroy intelligence, or otherwise the dictionary could never have been made. Hence, intelligence established words, instead of words establishing intelligence, which must possess the element of fact — the truth — existence — and intelligence and being conscious of one's self, are identical terms. The word, intellect, defined by Webster, is, "the faculty of the soul by which it knows." Now, the word, intelligent, is defined, "endowed with reason." Surely, this is a square admittance, that all living creatures are intelligent, without the aid of any established system of education. The smallest bug will endeavor to escape danger, and must therefore, possess reason for such an act. A dog even will go round a post, why? Because he *knows* he cannot go through it. Another word is used to represent knowledge — instinct, but all these words embrace the same circle, for what is the difference between instinct, and the knowledge of existence? What is the soul but this very unknowable energy — eternal existence?

Without the principle of imagination, nothing would exist to base the principle of education upon, that is to embrace the present general system of teaching, and what is meant when the term educate is used, depends upon so many elements, that a correct conveyance depends upon the particular school of training one is educated to. This goes to prove all the more what appears to be a fact, that the principle motive of exerting a power of influence,

termed education, is to cultivate a desire for exclusiveness out of pure defence for such an un-Christian state of things.


This very writing depends upon the dictionary authority to convey even a partial meaning, but no more can properly be claimed for words, than that they are absolutely relative in their character. Hence every one is dependent upon some method before the exchange of intelligence can occur. It is therefore no part of the motive in this writing, to inform the reader what the definition of the term, education, should be. The purpose is more to show that the fact of any term needing a definition is the very proof of its falsibility. Now when one comes to realize that the words used in definition are equally dependent for some other word to define it, the real character of a dictionary is exposed. The only question therefore is, whether the words used in definition are to reveal an honest use of such an important book, or whether the opportunity will be taken advantage of to justify the more learned in ruling the illiterate, or any human being who was not educated in the same school?

It would surely be a simple matter for a modern scholar to expose the deceptive character of the standard authority of the English language, but where is the scholar with the courage to do it when the temple would fall upon his own head? History reveals such sacrifices to be rare, in fact, they border upon the allegorical. This conveys to the mind a hint of what the term education in its honest sense is used to convey. It is in the seeking derived from the desire to learn, in precisely the same manner as food is sought by the sense of taste. Of course, this can be disputed literally, based upon the authority of the dictionary. It would no doubt make a thorough lexicographer shudder to realize in earnest that the dictionary was tampered with for the purpose of supporting

ignorance rather than being what is claimed for it, by itself, even—to assist in the obtaining of knowledge. This matter will be dealt with more thoroughly in other parts of the book, for it is to determine what constitutes education that must first be considered.

Education consists of two distinct features, and the confounding of them causes all the confusion in the exchange of intelligence. One feature represents experience, or actual sense, while the other represents information. It is the literal on the one hand, and the actual on the other. It is the real against its representation. It is the real, or its reflection in the mind—imagination. Hence, the great question of life is, is the imagination the equal of the real? If we decide from the authority of the dictionary, we must say that it not only claims imagination be to the equal, but holds it to be of even more importance. Now, who can settle the following question: Is imagination the equal of the real? Can any one decide for another whether they prefer the experience of an event, or the mere information? Can any one destroy the sense of their own existence, and be taught that what they do feel is false, and only what is taught them is real? Surely, no one can make a dictionary that can establish an authority of the pictures of things, being superior to that from which they were drawn. These assertions are not to enlighten "scholars"—they know it. It is therefore clear, that the term, education, stands for both the true and the false—the right and the wrong.

Language measures is the coin of intelligence, they should be at least the equal of the coins of merchandise, and if not, they disguise a hidden purpose, which every sincere scholar should seek to disclose, or hide himself. Who would not admit that a gold piece marked five dollars on one side, and ten on the other, would be an absurdity? What is the difference if the word, knowledge, is stamped




by its definition, a sense of existence, and also a mere information, based upon the power of man to establish a law — experience on the one side, information on the other, which? Surely, if civilization and peaceful society depends upon the defense of a fraud, then people would also go without calico for the want of counterfeit money to buy it with.

The great importance of words call for a careful consideration of their purity. A thinking person will no doubt admit this, but will he take the risk of expressing his honest opinion of it? Will he not be more liable to yield to his love for whatever position he may occupy in society? No man can read history and deny that all the great changes in the social order were accomplished by the courage to defy persecution, and overcome the love of ease, which is the lazy part of man's nature. Surely, if systems of education are founded upon this love of traditions and present custom, nothing but crude common sense will ever revise the corruption in the dictionary. Nothing but the opportunity of a great revolution would serve to correct these errors, for this writing is not pretended even, to effect an established authority that the social fabric of the present civilization rests upon. Every man who examines this matter can satisfy himself, and such a man, when he discovers the deceit, will take care of himself without the advice of any one. It is only "the fool" that puts his hand in the fire the second time.

A word and its definitions can be continually defined, and this gives a particular opportunity for deception by reason of choosing such a definition as will best fit the circumstances. There is always an end to an argument by which more can be added, and no man can become so educated to the use of words, which must necessarily be only representatives of mind conception, as to convince another of his actual meaning. The same words can be used to

confound the most logical argument, simply by means of different definitions. This should bring to the mind of an honest thinker, that just in proportion to his being educated in words, he is deprived of his natural power of development. If the reader will kindly recognize, that this writing is no exception to the rule by which every man possesses the power to think for himself, he will at least commence his education. Such a man must also acknowledge, if he is just to himself, that his interpretations of what is herein written may be entirely different from those which the writer intended. No man can derive more than a literal meaning from a literal argument. No character can be equivalent to that for which it stands. That is, a horse, and the picture of a horse, does not constitute two horses. Hence, a sincere man will readily observe the difficulty of showing the position of Webster's dictionary, when this very writing depends upon that authority.

The truth is the foundation that everything rests upon, and nothing can be established or decreed, for the same law that establishes, denies by its very act the stability of the establishment. Hence, a dictionary is established, and its stability depends upon the power of its defenders. A perfect authority for words is impossible, by reason of their dependence upon mankind, who are so organized that their self-defence depends upon their building up and tearing down. The principle of education being divided in the teaching of words, and that derived from a desire to learn — a natural development, it makes it impossible when the word is used to determine which is meant. No scholar can claim words to be more than forms, but the learning of these forms, is designated education, as much so as a conception of the senses. Of course it is well understood that an authority for terms must be established, but if in such a book is recorded definitions, with a glaring purpose of deception, education in its primary stage, is more to prevent a development of knowledge than to assist it.



A government is in consequence of the disposition in man, to monopolize his education as fast as he obtains it, and what under some circumstances, awakens a sense of brotherly love, under a system of education, the greatest degree of envy and malice can be easily cultivated. Hence, a reason why a government should not only establish, but protect such words as are necessary to name all known objects, their relations and actions, leaving all words that are derived from the poetry of imagination to be understood as such.

Mutual intelligence can only be conveyed when the terms used are mutually understood. It makes no difference what the form is, providing it is not a deceptive one. A man may be deceived by counterfeit coin, the liability of which causes strict laws to be made by the government, but words from which the social condition of a nation is formed, are left for the vanity of man to make playthings of. Why? Because the exclusive class can, by this means make simple understanding so extravagant, that a man equally intelligent, may be used as a servant, and also deprived of the means of defense. The book-taught man is educated, the man who hoes corn is educated by the process, but the former is taught the system of analysis, the latter is wholly dependent upon experience, and however trivial his education may be, it is the very base upon which analysis rests. The man who is taught a strict obedience to literal authority, his sincerity can only be possible by his strict holding to the superior value of words over the facts they represent, or he cannot be sincere without being ignorant of the value of conception, or original thoughts. That is, he accepts a method of growth upon a system of analysis, which makes the authority of man over man complete. It is like soaking bread in water, in a firm belief that it makes more bread. Therefore, an educated man, based upon book knowledge, has only the opportunity to


swell up, if he sincerely believes that his book knowledge is superior to the little experience he must have had to start with. On the other hand, the man who will disguise his knowledge of this deception in the use of words for his personal gain, will confound the most logical argument, from the fact that he comprehends the deception. The man who knows how to obtain a luxurious living by deceptive methods, is not the man who will admit it. But the principle of sincerity or what constitutes an honest man, is absolutely confined to the individual, and these general ideas are more to show that a man will expose his character in the effort to hide it.

MEANINGLESS WORDS.

CHAPTER V.

If an innocent being born upon the earth with its inheritance of life and desire for knowledge has no other protection than that which it may be taught by another, such an element as will power does not exist and the possibility of teaching, even, would also be a myth. Hence, no man can establish words or anything else but that another has the equal privilege of improving or tearing down; for, were it possible to establish an infallible authority for words, a man depending upon being taught could not apply a definition and much less two.


The very object of words is simply a method of conveying the expression of intelligence—knowledge—experience. It is only for deceptive purposes that words are treated as knowledge or intelligence. It is therefore, not even presumed that a sincere scholar is ignorant of this. But struggling humanity are completely at the mercy of those who will defend their own position by endeavoring to keep the masses ignorant. This is accomplished by taking advantage of the natural desire to learn, and from a greater degree of knowledge, a man is able to dictate the very form by which the expression of intelligence is transmitted from one to another. If an honesty of purpose prompted this interest in the welfare of others, words which are absolutely meaningless, would not be taught.



Society is as much a fixed principle as a desire for knowledge, yet the term is adopted to justify an exclusiveness from others, who are equally entitled to their existence, and as much a part of general society as those who protect their exclusiveness by trying to monopolize every degree of commerce, be it the conveyance of corn, or the fruit of intelligence. But the spirit of defence is as individually distributed, as both the desire to learn, and the love for society. Man's opportunity to develop may be destroyed by a betrayal of confidence, but not a particle of intelligence is ever infused into the brain of man. If the generality of men who are further advanced in methods of conveying the expression of intelligence believed themselves able to *create* intelligence they would never hide behind words with double meanings for the purpose of making their assertion meaningless to all those not initiated in this scheme of deception.

Those who believe that intelligence can be successfully conveyed will do well to study its numerous definitions, when a conclusion of what the word really means will be as impossible as to convey it to another. One could as well attempt to convey their eyes as the "faculty of the soul." We have so many words that apply to the same object, with their numerous definitions that the wonder is, how people can comprehend each other at all. The fact is, meaningless words are practically dropped just as soon as experience betrays their deceptiveness, hence, persons of the same caliber can easily understand each other. Whenever a person becomes so severely trained as to believe that two common laborers in earnest conversation are not understanding intelligently because the language cannot be found in a dictionary, such would do well to examine the book for the definition of fool.

When different definitions are given to a word it practically destroys the meaning of such a word. Thus the



important word, knowledge, is made meaningless if it can embrace experience and information both. The word, experience, has a distinct meaning—"practical personal acquaintance with any matter," in fact a real sense of an act entirely separate from any information from another. That is to say it depends absolutely for its conception upon the sense of existence. Now the word, information, calls for a source, as well as experience, but it may be lodged in another person for a communication is called for other than a sense of experience. It practically introduces another person and to disguise the deception of false information, the word, knowledge, is made to embrace the true and false both. Therefore, as the word practically qualifies the truth it is meaningless, in the sense that a term or formula applied to a truth and that which is false, does not represent the truth but merely allies itself to the false.

No one will dispute that information may convey a false condition, and this word embraces instruction and teaching. Also subordinate meanings which imply a creative power, would seem to be an attempt to add to a man even more than his own personality. That is, it seems to justify a man in asserting a condition from the imaginative element of his brain, which may be assumed to be knowledge when it is communicated to another. It may, therefore, be seen that the adding of the word, information, to the word, experience, in defining the word, knowledge, was more for the purpose of justifying the power of an informer, rather than to assist the clear definition that experience gives to the word knowledge. If this is a mere delusion, for what purpose was knowledge made to embrace information? Surely it would be as easy to say: I possess the experience, as to say: I possess the knowledge, which could be false or true at the pleasure of him who utters it. It would seem to be specially arranged so that

a man could talk without meaning anything. There is no question but that words are derived from man, but they do not antedate the spirit of oppression. Hence, if a man will oppress another by reason of knowing how, it is quite as reasonable to believe he would endeavor to monopolize the means of public communication, so as to prevent, or make it as difficult as possible for the general mass to acquire the means of defence.

Obstructions being the incentive to work, by which method only the intellectual faculties are developed, is no doubt well known to those who have experienced the difficulties. But when a man knows this, he can best consult his own conscience in regard to protecting an authority for words, that practically denies the pretended assistance towards the ignorant. The man who is sincere, will endeavor to remove obstructions he encounters, instead of using his knowledge to increase the difficulties for those behind. Otherwise, to disguise his deception, he will pretend to assist others by teaching the danger of them. Obstructions, which are only made to appear dangerous, and found to be delusions when they are encountered in earnest.

The word, education, is practically a meaningless word. It is only understood in connection with its surroundings, it can be scarcely spoken without explanation, and a great variety of definitions makes argument necessary to give a partial idea of what is meant by the expression: "The man is educated." To say: The man is born, is quite as comprehensive, for the words birth, education, comprehension, nourishment, conception, breeding, instruction, and many more words are identical, varying only according to a trained system of application. The same hidden motive will be discovered in this confusion. That is, to embrace the real with the imaginary, and therefore destroy the intellectual faculties rather than permit their development.

The disposition in man to progress makes him oppressive in proportion to education; or what would be just as expressive, in proportion to his experience of the birth of new ideas. The great deception of life is to pretend to help others, which is the most important discovery for a man to make. It cannot be taught, and is only knowable by an actual birth of the idea to the individual being. To teach a person experience is impossible. It is also impossible to prove that a person was ever improved by teaching him. But it is no difficulty for a man to determine for himself whether he received as much benefit from following others as he did to act from the conception of his own ideas.

The uniform definitions to all the words bearing upon knowledge and experience, will all point to one object, to justify and disguise the power of man to oppress each other. This idea is derived from the very means that are withheld in all methods of instruction. It must have been known before the effort to deprive others could have been so uniformly distributed through the dictionary.

The knowledge of this deception can only be discovered by the courage to test one's own ideas, and it will prove to such minds that a natural process of development is imitated and taught to weaklings as being essential to their development. It really guides such to an imaginary conception of the real, by which means the possibility of obtaining it becomes remote in proportion to the imaginative mind being so occupied as to prevent the real from being born. A man's mind filled with imagination will illuminate the ambition of another, until their only distress is that a third person will not accept their vision as being the only true light of happiness.

The imagination is only destroyed by the conception of the real, and while the real is only known by experience or actual birth, such as possess it can observe the folly of

imagination, the possessor of which being too illuminated to comprehend the value of the real. This must be so to form a contrast, for the real would be a blank but for its background of imagination. But just as fast as the real appears the imagination disappears, only to concoct more imagination from the new reality.

There are thousands of words in the dictionary that are merely expressions of imaginative ideas, and the proof of which can be found in the labored care to define such words as, truth, fact, experience, knowledge, reason, etc. A studied effort may be easily discovered by a careful comparison of words representing an actual object. By adding a variety of definitions it can be seen that the authority of man is in every case made to appear equal to the actual sense or experience. The definition to the word, truth, makes it appear that man can establish authority equally as binding upon the conscience of another, as real experience or an actual birth. That the mind will receive this false authority is because they are prepared in the innocence of youth to receive it, and after being entirely captivated by the apparent charm of imagination, to undeceive such is as impossible as to raise grapes upon an imaginary vine.

The word, imagination, is as meaningless as the fantastic pictures of a diseased brain, which are embraced by this word. To convey by a system of education these visionary pictures, and by the same process place them upon the same elevation as facts is to destroy the mind for the conception of reality, which is only possible in the healthy condition of the brain—the natural—from which all imagination even gets its supply. The most sensible definition of imagination derived from the simple ability to distort mind pictures of real observation is, such thoughts as are never realized. To imagine happiness one must first possess a real conception of happiness, only at-

tainable by the conception of unhappiness. A fool is always contented the same as one could *imagine* a man to be before he was born. The mind that merely acts in imitation of another will wear the appearance of happiness because it cannot discern happiness from unhappiness.

People who are trained to believe in no other school but the one they are wedded to, betray their ignorance in proportion to their sincerity. A careful reasoner can observe the variety of schools or systems, each of which, holding their infallible ideas, are apparently justified by an equal degree of success, even in opposite directions. Men, or organized system, have the same equal right to defend the same, and the simple fact, that two men will show, with equal ability, that their particular system of ethics, is the only true one, proves both to be false by reason of neither being able to sincerely believe their system, and also extend a courteous charity toward the system of their opponent.

A doubt will inspire the faculty of reason and lead to development, but when a man can imagine a material fact and frankly express himself as having no doubt about it, he simply betrays to the man who dares to encourage his own faculties, that his position is unfortunately normal. The necessity of life demands a continual condition of doubt, and therefore the conflict between imagination and reality, is the natural necessity of such a condition. A man stops his intellectual growth just as soon as he stops doubting. No other conclusion can be reached, for when a man reaches his destination, and can also imagine all there is, he is thoroughly fortified against any further intellectual growth.


It may therefore, be seen, that this writing can be of no interest whatever to the person who is perfectly sanguine, and will neither encourage or admit a shadow of doubt. It shows the complete mastery of the sense of



imagination over the faculty of birth, or the susceptibility of education. Growth is stopped for the natural privilege to learn, which must be a fact to every one's mind, who ever learned anything, is overcome by the intoxication of imagination. It illuminates the brain until the victim believes the growth of his visions to be the real aim of life. Such a man's opinion of himself he will imagine others hold toward him, and men of this caliber, naturally affiliate together, and expose their ignorance by the assumption of superiority over those who are doubtful, and therefore more charitable, even to the extent of acknowledging this assumption of wisdom.

Meaningless words are the support for imaginary ideas, and the authority for teaching a system of language, must necessarily be protected by those who depend for a livelihood upon their ability to deceive. Realism is apparently held in derision by such as derive profit from the imaginary pictures drawn by these meaningless words. But the impossibility of doing this except the same words applied to a fact also, must be apparent, for the system of analogous reasoning is important before an imaginary picture can be conveyed from one mind to another. For instance, a person having no sense of the effect of fire would show no fear by being told he would be burned in a fire. On the other hand, having a sense knowledge of its character, and also an expressive term applied to it, it would convey a sense of fear by the mere imagination of being burned.

Therefore, the basis of mind pictures is always facts, but if a confusion of meanings can be applied to words, it becomes a simple process to train a person theoretically in a system of imaginary delights. A man who will deliberately protect this confusion in the exchange of sense expressions, would be put to a severe test if compelled to exist, or supply his waste of tissue by the principle of



imagination from which he pretends to develop his mind. It is only by real energy and existing facts that deception even is possible, and man's privilege to develop himself enables him to use the same energy in depriving others of an equal privilege. The pretense of assisting others is exploded in the great care and effort to teach words to youth with double meanings, for the purpose of justifying the delusion that imaginary pictures are the equal of the real. The power to do this is largely obtained from the support of the trained victims, who, because they have no new birth of a natural character, will defend to the death such as can influence them in the glory of imagination, until even their desire for reality gradually expires.

The general principle of language is as much a phenomenon as the sense of understanding. Its particular form has nothing to do with human experience, it is prompted from the desire for society, and nothing is more natural than to devise some means of communication, the superiority of which method depends wholly upon its simplicity and mutual convenience in effecting an understanding. The effort to maintain meaningless words, is to obstruct as far as possible, the exchange of ideas, it is the effort to justify the power of man to oppress each other. Nothing is plainer than the unnecessary use of these words, if the good will toward humanity was a reality. It is absurd to defend them in literal authority, and also a sincere purpose to benefit humanity. No one could claim it to be a benefit to throw another into a well to develop a disposition to overcome difficulties, and if the purpose of teaching words to innocent humanity is to benefit such, surely, any system that would obstruct itself would also betray its character to those at least who are wicked enough to defend it.

The importance of written authority should, above all things, depend upon its being consistently written. Its


impartial character only would commend its purity. But the fact that words of value are merely the representative of reality, and also that the reality must first be born to the mind before the word can be understood, shows plainly that the motive to confound the definition of words, is to obstruct humanity, and is known by those who possess advanced knowledge, for only such could possibly devise a system by which it could be accomplished. The pretended benefactors of mankind will bear an unenviable record in the unwritten book of prosperity, if they attempt to justify their position in defence of an authority — the dictionary — merely to protect the oppression of the past.

INTELLECT.

CHAPTER VI.

In all the words that bear upon the sense of existence, or actual experience, there may be discovered a strained effort to confuse their meaning. The words intellect, consciousness, perception, conception, intuition, understanding, comprehension, experience, cognition, recognition, and sense, are all used to convey slightly varying meanings of the word know, which is the intellect of life, the actual sense of being, it is impossible to convey this absolute element. It is strictly individual and what the element of intellect really is, is only knowable to the creature possessing it.

Man cannot know until this phenomenal light is thrown upon his mind. He may exist, but the individual sense of it is the intelligence of existence, and quite another element of existence. It cannot be measured by any device of man, hence in the employment of terms to express intelligence—simple language—they are no more related than a chalk mark is to a river. The representative character of words is doubtless well known, but the book trained men will not acknowledge these simple facts, while they can employ their knowledge in the protection of their exclusiveness. The term, ignorant, is used with a meaningless freedom. It applies no less to one man than another, for there is no evidence of a man being intelligent who is not also ignorant. In fact ignorance measures the intellect in proportion to knowledge



revealing it. A progressive life is a continual birth, a mere surprise at previous ignorance, and an equal suspicion that greater surprises are yet in store, for with every experience there is no evidence that ignorance is lessened thereby, but to the contrary men of advanced knowledge have admitted that their ignorance was all the more apparent.

The mere teaching of a specific form of language has nothing to do with the phenomenon of intellect which is a positive element of eternal existence. This must be so, or the assumed creative power of man would be admitted, and the means to overcome ignorance would not be wanting to the men who could create at will. He surely could not possess the power to create, and be ignorant of the method, or of what he created. It is therefore the natural desire for social liberty, the very essence of intellect, that forms are sought to convey what the desire is. There can be no method of proving what particular form of language is superior, when intelligent comprehension is exchanged. It can also be seen that general intelligence is not increased or diminished by merely distributing a method of communication. The mere discovery of a fact should not be mistaken for intellect, for it is by the existence of this faculty that the discovery becomes possible.

Human nature is evidently as fixed as intellect, and man's power of freedom is limited to the re-arranging of things according to his own will. Besides, there is no feature more prominent than the disposition to shirk the responsibility of the necessary labor to preserve life. Man seeks to monopolize his discovery, which in every instance is no less than the birth of knowledge. This feature is embraced in the sense of curiosity, essential to inspire sufficient courage to progress.

There is no evidence that letters, words, or any forms whatever, possess a single element of intelligence,

and it must be clear that such forms are powerless to convey other than its expression, which is evidence enough of its previous existence.

The effort of man to monopolize his discoveries is nowhere more apparent than in the records he leaves behind. The continual changing of language, and forms of expression, is evidence enough of the insincerity of cultured man toward those who are unfamiliar with his methods. In a general sense the professed brotherhood of man, is a mere pretension for the purpose of oppression and robbery. There is no recorded evidence more glaring than the effort to make words and forms equivalent to what they represent. This fraud is clearly recorded in the dictionary, from which all persons so disposed can determine for themselves. The very object of such a book is a pretended assistance to a more universal brotherhood of humanity, it being the authority of language so that men of intelligence may understand each other. It fails in this particular wholly, and in addition to its disguising the true intent of history, it is a convenient protection to the exclusive, monopolizing disposition of mankind, and his wit of justification is founded upon the power to do it.

The pretense of the learned people toward the masses of crude humanity must be thoroughly known to an ordinary student of language. Surely if a person was sincere in assisting a poor man, he would not give him a counterfeit dollar, and endeavor to teach him a sense of obligation besides. Now, words are the coin by which the expression of intelligence can be exchanged, yet in the interest of monopoly the dictionary is filled with counterfeit words. It is pretended that man's very morality depends upon a familiarity with these words, counterfeits in the sense that they are not what they purport to be. No doubt that ordinary scholars can exchange their ideas intelligent-

ly, but if educators claim to be sincere in benefiting humanity, how can they defend a system of language so difficult to acquire, that the man is beyond assistance before he is able to comprehend the means? Besides is it more important to protect the established authority of man, than to encourage the natural desire for the means to exchange intelligent ideas? Are the institutions of society, depending upon the power of man to defend, more important than a simple method of conveying ideas? Are methods so important that the man unequal to their acquirements, must be excluded from social privilege? From whence does man obtain this authority to dictate the method by which others equally entitled to their intelligence shall communicate? Does the mere knowing how to deceive another justify the deception? Should the ideas of dead men be protected, while the living are suffering for a simple method of expressing their intelligence?

In the growth of words, or knowledge, from which society and various institutions have become established, should the original purpose be lost sight of in the protection of special establishments? All special forms of society are the result of language, or a method of communicating intelligence, and regardless of the numerical support of social bodies, the principle of language, and the desire of man to impart his ideas to others, is from the inspiration of true intelligence.

There is plenty of evidence in the possession of the man who would deceive another, that he has no right to do it, but he will cling to his method until the lack of support destroys the confidence in his power of deception. The great variety of social organizations reveals the disposition of man to prey upon each other. A numerical body can only be held together by restraint, or mutual intelligence, when the natural freedom of man is considered. Also a

mutual understanding is only possible by a uniform method of expression. Hence, exclusive societies are established, and protected by the form of expressing intelligence. It appears superior in proportion to the success it meets with, but it should be seen that the uncultured are the common prey for those who are qualified to deceive them, and regardless of the apparent need of assisting the untrained man, he can only realize the deception of exclusive societies, by being deceived by them.

The very growth of language and the various tongues sub-divided into dialects, is the evidence of man's effort to oppress each other. It is also the very means by which the deception is exposed, for did a uniform language exist of a positive character, as positive as intellect, there could be no social strife, and what appears to be a necessity, is exposed from the effort to justify a particular form of words. The mooted question of permitting evil that good may result, is beyond the power of man to change, without pulling the temple of natural order down upon his own head. Man discovers the absolute condition of things more and more, as he advances in knowledge. He finds evil to be an actual fact, and in no sense permitted by man. It reveals the consistent order of Nature, for man's very intellect depends upon his sense of good and evil, and if there were no evil, how could man be conscious of a perpetual goodness, or, how could man see without seeing something. What is termed the "fall of man," is the only consistent method by which the phenomenon of intelligence could be literally illuminated. What conceivable pleasure could there be to existence without knowing it? What would be the character of man's freedom if he was obliged to roll down hill the same as a stone, and feel thankful for the privilege without the sense of feeling to enable him to know it. It is clear enough that evil is the necessary counterpart of goodness, and just as

necessary to the freedom of choice, as an incline is before a boy could slide down hill.

There is no possible justification in doing evil because it has an absolute existence. No one could avoid evil if there was none to avoid, neither can evil be known without sensing it, any more than heat could be known without feeling. All exclusiveness is self convicting from the necessity of persecuting any opposition to maintain the position. It is therefore, evident, that languages grow by the very means that people take to disguise their wickedness; it is also evident, that the men who are able to establish written authority, know of their own wickedness and injustice toward the more ignorant, or they would not arrange words so as to protect their exclusive position at the expense of those whom they pretend to serve.

If injustice and persecution is an actual assistance to development, and it doubtless is, it is no base for a man to rest his conscience upon, for man admits his inconsistency in his effort to compel others to follow his example, or acknowledge his exclusive ideas. Human duty is confined to the space a man's conscience occupies, whichever way he turns, and if he steals from others, and tries to calm his conscience by giving to the needy, he will suffer all the more, by observing the peaceful serenity of those who partake innocently of his stolen charity.

History is evidence enough of man's periodical failure, to establish exclusive systems to control human nature. The bringing together of all humanity into one fold of brotherly love, is a natural impossibility, and proved so by the confounding of language, the only means by which such a result is possible. Humanity neither needs or asks any assistance until the natural confidence is betrayed by those who pretend to assist and expose their pretensions, by demanding a greater service in exchange.

It has always been a weak excuse by men who are called learned, that whatever could not be proved false, was the proof that it was true, and whatever takes place in human affairs, is due to the intellectual effort of such persons as elect themselves to rule over the moral welfare of man. It simply acknowledges the power of the intellect to form the means of communicating thought conceptions, and the fact of words and forms of expression being placed out of reach of the very persons they are offered to, shows plainly that the object is self-protection. All technical words are for the purpose of disguising simple facts, and make their discovery as difficult as it was for Jacob to obtain his wife. Plenty of excuses are offered by those who depend upon their power of deception to obtain a living. The plea that people would destroy themselves if drugs and poisons were called by their simple names, is weak, for more probably they would not be destroyed so fast if the desire in man for exclusiveness was not at the bottom of this mischief.

It is therefore clear, that social exclusiveness depends upon the cultivation of mere forms, and the more difficult they are to comprehend, the more secure is the exclusiveness. Yet, the greatest difficulty in this effort to monopolize the result of natural intellect, is to justify man's authority over man, or an honest right to dictate by what forms the sense of knowledge shall be expressed. Man's absolute dependence upon the fundamental principle of knowledge, is a standing reproof against the continual effort to give to man's work a more superior appearance than the real actually possesses. This is seen in the effort to inspire terms and forms with actual intelligence. In the effort of man to create, his failure is no more apparent than the continuous effort to make it appear so. Man has no means to prove his right to authority except the muscular power to enforce it, and having this power, he

no sooner discovers it than he acknowledges to those he oppresses, their equal right, also, by the very act of fortifying this power, for fear of being deprived of it.

When a man is conscious of doing right, he has no fear of it being a mistake, but when he builds a wall around his possessions, it is not so much to keep himself in the enclosure, but in reality to keep others out. Hence, the mere power to act, neither inspires or even suggests the particular method of acting. It rather proves the liberty of the individual intellect, and the individual man, or whatever system he organizes, betrays this fact by the effort made in defence. One must admit that none but a fool would build a substantial defence unless he had a conception of some power that would possibly disturb his position. It is, therefore, in the very preparation for defence, that man admits his intelligence, and also concedes it to others by his effort in protecting himself from them.

There is no feature in life more noticeable than the division of creature life into classes or species. It is a natural phenomenon, and needs no special investigation, beyond the individual sense or intelligence enough to observe it. This very division discloses the fact of a common intellect, embracing the minute insect and gigantic animal. Every living thing is intelligent, because it "knows" its own kind. Such also possess the power of reason, the proof of which is in the defence, and preparation of defence against whatever would interfere with their chosen method.

The injustice of man toward man, explodes his boasted superiority over any portion of creature life. Man adopts the same principle in defence of his social equals, that all animals do. He will treat his dog, after training him to be obedient, with more consideration than he will another man, who expressed his intelligence in terms of a

different character. Hence, creature life, that is classed as human beings, and are susceptible of an interchange of language, are yet divided and sub-divided into classes, the most prominent factor being the form of language, or a special method of conveying common intelligence. It is the possible interchange of language that gives the human family its progressive character, and excludes the possibility of man to establish any system of authority without exposing in the method of building it up, the very means by which it can be torn down.

It is an obvious error, to such at least as appreciate their real blessings and birthright, that people more devoted to the form of an act than the effect, are in any sense a factor of civilization. The appearance they affect is but the absorption of the intelligent energy of others. People who are sure, and express no doubt in whatever ideas they possess, betray an intellect, but they also betray the fact that it is smothered and used only in a subordinate position. The absence of doubt, and surety freely expressed, is the result of confidence, and after a man submits either by his own will, or compulsion from another, he acts from influence, and ceases to be a factor in human progress. This is a fact, because a man governed by his own intellect will be in doubt, and sure of nothing until his own intellect grasps it firmly. Even then, the man who thinks by his own intellect, will express doubt in the forms of expressing ideas.

The right can only be determined by the first principle of knowledge — sense — intellect — a consciousness of it. Influence and confidence are but elements of obstruction, and the method by which the men of advanced knowledge rule the world. But confidence can only be maintained by rendering an account to the confiding person, and influence is a circumstance that practically removes responsibility, for if a man falls from the influence

of a blow, responsibility ceases with the power to prevent falling. Therefore, in whichever way one turns, he finds no method offered by others that will stand the test equal to one's own conception. Man is subjected to a constant influence, but this circumstance does not justify its employment with intent, for natural influence will correct itself, but for a man to exert an influence over another with intent to deceive, he can never escape the responsibility for the wrong.

It is honesty that rules the world, and the mere ability of man to form exclusive societies is the extent of his power, such societies may rule by the power of deceit, but the persons embracing it will have to render an account to their own conscience, and the responsibility will rest upon the person who would deprive another of the same right to self-conception.

Political liberty is gradually invading the circle of exclusiveness, that the deception in recorded language has enabled a few people to maintain. The spirit of oppression is only broken by the power of the oppressed. But if all were masters, all would be slaves, and when it is discovered that the wickedness of the ruling men, is the very means by which they have ruled, it will also be discovered that the natural prosperity of humanity is to be honest and just, and the disposition to rule makes all the necessity for ruling.

SOCIETY.

CHAPTER VII.

The simple meaning of the word, society, is companionship, but like all other words pertaining to the welfare of humanity, meanings are appended in such a manner as to betray the same motive, the protection of particular exclusiveness. The most advanced class of society is that which becomes cultivated to a degree sufficiently to establish a form of written language, and in the pretence to assist their fellowmen to better means of communication, this class betrays their selfish love for their elevation, by elevating the means of getting up. Hence, the word, society, is given a definition with special reference to the most elevated, it reflects upon themselves as occupying the only position entitled to be termed society. The absurdity of the definition may be seen in the expression: "He is sufficiently educated to appear in society." Now as this implies that he was previously absent from society, it also shows the effort made by those who are cultivated to monopolize and pervert language in the exclusive interest.

There is no material alteration to a man if he is called by a variety of names, and it does not change the fact of a man being in society previous to his being especially fitted for it. It may be seen that a man is never prepared for, a society, but instead, "for society," it is therefore, the society, in the ordinary sense of understanding. The monopoly of words bearing upon a natural and inevitable condition and applying them with more force to a condi-

tion purely the work of man's wit, betrays a purpose from which no other justification can be even pretended, then the power to do it. But the wrong cannot be disguised, for the pretence of benefiting humanity by the teaching of words, perverted for the very purpose of deceit, cannot be hidden from the educated man, even if he is whipped into line by threats of not recognizing him, if he dare to expose the means by which an exclusiveness is maintained.

This effort to fortify a position betrays a knowledge of weakness, or at least an admission of danger. If it is from the "depravity of ignorance" that exclusive society endeavors to defend itself, it should employ honest means, rather than employ a superior knowledge to protect their own wickedness. Knowledge surely enlightens the world, but the liberty to obtain it is always obstructed by those who are the most enlightened. This must remain a natural fact to inspire the growth of humanity. Man's very growth forms the obstacle for those behind just as soon as he is able to remove it himself. But why not be honest about it, instead of pretending to assist the masses of humanity, who would cultivate themselves if they were not deprived of the liberty to do it. Perhaps not to a special form, but when a particular form is established for the sole purpose of teaching the principle of obedience of man to man, is there any authority for a form established by power that the same principle will not tear down as well? The disposition in man to protect his particular form, his individual form, is extended to his companionship with others, and to establish any authority for a mere form is as impossible as to change an object by giving its name two meanings.

If there was a necessity for confusion of language it could be easily shown. But as words are but the coin to exchange ideas, the attempt of man to pervert their value by giving them double meanings, is evidently for the pur-

pose of interfering with the ideas. It would be a parallel case, for gold coin to be so constructed as to suggest what use it should be put to. The disposition in man to get more than he pays for, is the principal reason why he prefers being served to serving himself. But whichever way he seeks to justify the use of his power to compel obedience and service from his fellowmen, he cannot destroy the deceitful means he leaves behind him.

The individual reflects the society he belongs to, and it is just as natural as rolling down hill for people of similar ideas to affiliate together, but the right to influence the ideas of others is wanting. It is proved in every instance where power is in any way exerted to destroy the natural privilege of every creature to use their own faculties. A right needs no sustaining power to deprive another of judging for himself what his acts shall be, he simply denies the right to others he claims for himself. The individual man or society he affiliates with are identical, so when a man speaks of society he really means himself, for he will at least agree better with only those who agree with him. He practically denies the right to interfere with others by using his power to do it. For in the social struggle of the world there is no quality to power, and the right of power to its own force is a fixed eternal right, but for a man to exert his own strength either muscularly or intellectually to deprive another of the same privilege is wrong.

The very fact that a man would restrain another from an act of violence is a square commitment that the individual use of power can be wrong as well as right. Therefore, when one restrains another for what appears to be violence, it depends upon his motive whether the interference is justified or not. If he acts from a natural humane sense toward a defenceless weakling, he is simply doing what he would be grateful for if he was similarly

situated. Self is the very base of reason, and when men act with the distinct consciousness that they are about to strike themselves, it is the only method of justifying an act of interference toward another. The mere supposition that the judgment of another was inferior, and he should therefore submit cheerfully to a greater degree of intelligence, is a method of reasoning that will not work, for if the man is really inferior, how can he bring his sense of judgment up to the same degree as his critic. Every person that is honest and acting their individual conviction must necessarily feel it to be right. Man has no method of measuring his degree of intelligence except by his own, thus he is ignorant beyond the comparison of his own ideas.

The effort to establish an authority which illiterate people will cheerfully acknowledge can only be accomplished by deceitful means, for illiteracy practically excludes a defence, and humble submission is but the natural law of necessity. It is the advantage taken, by those who have the intelligent power over the innocent ignorance, that betrays the deception and injustice. For an ignorant person not being to blame for a condition that knowledge only could reveal, and also surrounded with educated designers, it is not strange that the brute spirit of defence would occasionally crop out. Also every case of illiterate violence is carefully noted to prove the natural depravity of man. But if men who are educated and parade their literate acquirements, will willfully deceive the ignorant, surely the propensity of man for depravity should not be added to the ignorance of which all mankind is endowed, and of nothing is he more innocent. Certainly the knowledge of doing wrong is only possible when what is right is also apparent, and a man who will do wrong with the weak excuse of the power to do it, is more to blame than his innocent victim which is by this method made to serve.

It by no means follows that civilization, progress, and a high order of society would be wanting in the absence of this strict discipline over crude humanity. It is far more probable that a mistaken idea is purposely encouraged to disguise this abominable deception, for it must be well known to the cultivated class that civilization is due to the desire to be civilized, and history shows plainly that only where the liberty of man is encouraged by his natural surroundings, does he become more civilized. Several circumstances are considered in this constant effort to compel the illiterate to serve the literate, one of which is doubtless a fact that in proportion to the civilization of a man will he discover the deception previously imposed upon him, but the flattering position he reaches, and the fear of ostracism, will bring out his self importance, when he will soon become as apt in the oppression of his fellowmen as the examples he sees around him. No one who dares to expose this outrage can possibly expect any other reward than a consciousness of self-imposed duty, from which source only is the happiness of life derived. Besides in this age of boasted liberty, free speech, and so much talk about the freedom of man, woman, and child, it makes the intent to deceive all the more glaring when only particular methods of defence will be recognized by the magnates who pretend to control the English language.


The absurdity of this pretence, is exposed by the very effort to control education, and just as impossible as the control of sunlight. It is only the illiterate that can possibly be deceived by this wickedness; and as every school book teaches, or encourages, a spirit of scorn toward those who are unfamiliar with the mere form of expression, an illiterate person is hushed to silence. It is therefore, absurd, to require of a person methods of which he is ignorant, before his honest complaint will be noticed,

and if in sheer despair at having his intelligence ignored, he acquaints himself with these methods, he quickly learns their only importance is to deceive the product laborers.

A thorn will remain a thorn, only to the person who senses the pain. Also, as a rule, the individual could suffer the pain, as well in silence, as to attempt to convince another who never had a similar experience. Therefore, thorns are more successfully removed, by the particular one who suffers the pain. This natural feature of life, is taken advantage of by those who know how to do it, and because the ignorant are unable to understand why they are obliged to serve others equally as competent to support themselves, they are practically told to remove their own thorns, for the principle of oppression is but the obstacle to incite the liberty of man, to progress by his own effort.

Some method of language is the natural outcome of society, and the brotherhood of humanity is limited to division according to the mere style or method of expressions the intelligence of man suggests. Hence, exclusiveness is more successfully maintained by methods of expression, in proportion to the intricate difficulty in comprehending them. The effort to defend this principle as being right, requires the combined talent of the literate class, and ignorantly termed by some, "the educated class."

The following fact stands out to face the literate defenders of what they claim to be right: Nature is constantly asserting it to be a wrong, and whatever success power seems to accomplish, it must be admitted, that the power to act does not justify the right to act. A strong hold would seem to be perfectly secure while it was in possession of the entire means by which it could be overcome. That is to say: If the power of an exclusive society is able to control the method of attack, or the ammunition—the language—it would naturally seem to be secure. This is certainly the object, which is glaringly



exposed by the double meaning of all words relating to the sense of existence, or experience. This deception is simply the attempt to make the authority of man equal to that of the Creator. Call the wonderful phenomena of existence by whatever term you will — God, or Nature,— the effort of man to equal this power has always failed. Also, in trying to separate God from Nature, the same deceptive disposition is apparent. The same difference between the teachings of man and the sense of existence, is that between a horse and a picture. While it can be flippantly retorted, that a man can be scarcely less than a fool, who believes the picture of a horse to be the equal of the horse, the following question is not so easy : By what authority, and for what purpose, is information called knowledge, and knowledge called experience, when experience is the sense of existence ?

Exclusive society is based upon the natural principle of the division of creature life. It is self-love, and proved so by the familiar adage of "birds of a feather flock together." Now the care and importance given to the most exquisite method of expression, shows the same disposition to deceive the product laborer, which all mutually depend upon without any delicacy whatever, when necessity makes its demands. Money lovers are constantly in the embrace of others, also etymologists are never so happy as when they find their counterpart in the knowledge of words. A distinguishing mark is almost unconsciously adopted, no less than some particular "feather" by which even strangers fraternize.

While it is not strange that people of similar ideas, and those possessed with a special form of expression fraternize, it is strange that a person can carry an honest expression of countenance, who knows of the pretended assistance in educating the ignorant. It is perfectly plain that educators work for money, and also reformers. But

how can a person devote himself to obtaining his necessities, gratifying this desire, and be just to any other cause which might conflict? That which he desired the most would influence his conduct, and what controls more powerfully than the necessity of self-preservation? Therefore, to justify this desire for exclusive society, no less than self-love, the necessity for teaching is the first principle to be taught.

To justify the principle of teaching, of course the necessity of being taught forms the base. Now the greed of those men in former ages, (when the dictionary began to take form) is more evident by the cunning manner in defining words, than by any other means. It was doubtless evident to them that mere teaching of simple terms of expression, by which a more extended brotherhood could be established, would thereby make the teacher as common as the taught. Man's greed will always expose him, however sincere he may appear, and therefore to protect his assumed right to teach, the happy idea probably occurred that a special form of language would disguise the motive, and also protect an exclusive right to dictate the form of expression. This naturally led to excesses, and no book will show the duplicity of man more than the dictionary in which he endeavors to make his power to teach, equal to the divine and sacred inheritance that no man possesses without knowing it—a conscious sense of his existence.

The example of Nature is man's great school of instruction, and any effort to criticise, or suggest improvements in her management exposes the ignorance of man by his very pretence of wisdom. The science of etymology, syntax, astronomy, and geology merely establish the method by which discoveries are made. These sciences add nothing to the actual existence—to facts—to the truth. Hence, the expression: The revolution of the earth was established, gives the impression that man

caused it to revolve, when he only established the method by which its revolutions were discovered. This persistent effort of man to make himself prominent is nowhere exposed more, than by his arrangements of language so as to keep his own glory in advance of the wonders he discovers.

It can therefore be seen that forms are the bone of contention more than the facts represented, and by this means is the conceit and deception of man exposed by the very effort he makes to protect his only power, that is to establish forms. Hence, circles of society are schooled with care in forms of expression for this enables them to support each others' ideas, and exclude all others who are equally dependent upon the same planet for existence. The universal brotherhood of humanity is therefore conceded by the great variety of social classes that humanity is divided into. But the practical consummation of such a feat is impossible while forms of intercourse are purposely arranged to prevent it.

It is doubtless by the natural order of things that a variety of forms shall constitute the means of communicating mind pictures, but the fact cannot be disputed that the power in man to oppress others is no more right than the privilege of defence. It is therefore, this feature that betrays the dishonesty of man in pretending to teach special forms for the sole purpose of benefiting humanity. This insincerity, exposed by the very method to cover it up, is the feature to guard against rather than the disposition to group together by reason of exclusive ideas. It is the pretended claim of authority that an exclusive society tries to establish, that fastens the responsibility of wickedness upon them, rather than those who are merely guilty of conveying their ideas by a different form.

An honest society to be just must be self-supporting, for when it depends upon another society for support, it con-

demns the very principle by which it maintains its exclusiveness. A moral teacher can more readily infuse an idea of deception into the mind of another than he can moral ideas that are protected by a dishonest method. Hence, in the disposition in man to elevate himself, he must depend upon his own power without presuming to possess authority to compel others to not only help him up, but also support him while he is up.

The privilege of humanity in elevating themselves socially is a mutual right, but because an exclusive class discovers the power to enslave the weaker portion of their kind, it in no sense justifies the service. It betrays the motive to be more for the sake of the service than to benefit the slave. This is also shown by the apparent kindness of the master in the care of his slaves, simply to make them more serviceable.

The individual is naturally exclusive, he measures everything by his own sense. Hence, in matters of opinion it is absolutely impossible for him to organize. He is however, prompted by various influences to organize by which means he becomes limited to the conditions of the society he groups with. The principle of society is not progressive, but rather protective, hence, it presents a limit like the lines to a circle. And whereas the individual sense may be as undisturbed as ever, the natural liberty to progress is restrained by the lines prescribed by the conditions of associates.

An honest motive, only such as the sense of consciousness may determine, can justify a voluntary act of submission to rules laid down by another. A man is persuaded to associate or join with others more to strengthen a purpose than to benefit the man. If the purpose is to interfere with the rights of others it must necessarily be disguised. Hence, the same natural confusion of all the various forms of society, simply reflects the individual

who is always free to sense his own opinion. But as the motive determines the character of the act, so should societies be judged, and when a society that pretends to elevate humanity and point out the danger in the path of life, are so anxious to promote a universal brotherhood, as to rob the product laborer of half his toil under pretense of a necessity for teaching him morality, the motive betrays the injustice.




EQUALITY.

CHAPTER VIII.

The individuality of the sense of being is thoroughly established, or fixed, a fact that every person can determine according to the degree of their knowledge. Equality would destroy the individual identity and were two living things equal in every feature of structure the task of comparison would depend upon the means, methods, or terms, to convey sense, measurement, language.

Only in one particular can equality be applied to living beings which is in the phenomenon of life itself. Life and the eternal existence of things is all there is that a being possesses of an equal character. Man has no power to qualify life and matter—the two elements which cannot be approached by the forms merely, that this same mysterious power enables man to make. We are therefore, equal in the possession of these two elements—life and matter—material and motion. In degree only are we unequal, and this feature would seem to be necessary to the eternal agitation of matter.

Persons who have not been trained and schooled into specific shape, can doubtless comprehend the value of their common sense without a proscribed method. It is the only feature of equality that humanity rests upon. Human duty is revealed to the individual by the medium sense of consciousness. No man can improve upon this principle for he depends upon this power for every thought and action that his own sense reveals. Desire prompts a



man to oppress his brother and the established forms that society so tenaciously clings to is to preserve the class division of the human race.

The power to do wrong is the fundamental principle of liberty, for in the absence of a choice of action the very incentive of life would be wanting. What we understand by the term, liberty, is the very force by which man develops. It is not strange, therefore, that man will do wrong; and prompted by his desires he will go to destruction in proportion to his persistency in defying the warnings of his common sense. It is impossible to teach right and wrong by reason of the absolute individuality of consciousness. The confusion of language betrays this very difficulty, and reflects also the disposition of mankind to be governed by their own senses. Man's own desires prevent him from becoming a moral teacher, he no sooner discovers his power to teach than he endeavors to make every other creature obedient to him, his success depends upon a strong determination to overcome the warnings of his own senses. History shows plainly that some of the greatest wrongs were perpetrated upon mankind while they had the appearance of being right.


Human nature is charged with depravity, to disguise the wrong that is only possible by the power of man to teach his fellowmen obedience. Upon this principle whole nations have lived in luxury upon the toil of slaves, who, it was pretended, were ignorant of their wickedness. Therefore, the justification of an act cannot depend upon the power to perform it. The very process of life is a conflict between right and wrong, and to determine what is right, is only possible by individual conception, the same as sugar is discovered to be sweet, or that fire burns.

The power to set up an authority to teach human duty has always failed, because the teacher, upon general principles, demands a service, and the desire for promi-

nence is so great that obedience to the teacher is the principal element taught. The results from the natural desire to learn is claimed to be due to the principle of teaching. Nothing is more misleading, for it is doubtless well known to every person in possession of advanced knowledge, that they obtained it in defiance of what was taught them. Persecution, social ostracism, and the effort of the learned to monopolize their knowledge, is proof enough of the insincerity of men who pretend to sacrifice themselves for the welfare of others.

The relation of form to facts should be well considered by a sincere student, but the person who has accepted cheerfully the guidance of others is an obedient slave, and can no more determine their own interests than a man can find his way in the dark. Their own light being ignored for borrowed light they can see only what the borrowed light will reveal. Men who are willing to lend their light will protect their own interests first, and they will therefore, adopt whatever form that will commend the obedience of others. A person therefore, who has been thoroughly trained to a condition of obedience will not submit cheerfully until his natural conception of liberty becomes a blank. A form to such minds is a fact, having neglected the necessary energy to keep their own light burning, they will cling to whatever form a designing man chooses to teach.

If the welfare of humanity was what prompted the principle of teaching human duty, the equal right of every living creature to their natural inheritance would be acknowledged. But the facts which experience betrays, shows that teaching and the disposition in man to shirk his personal responsibility, embrace each other. That is to say, man's desire to develop himself will so far outweigh his sense of justice that he will compel others to serve his purpose by any method of teaching he can form-



ulate. The mere teaching in accord with what was learned by the same process is like passing buckets in a line to a fire, it is too automatic to be regarded as human ; and the weakness of logic derived from a sense of obedience, or an effort to serve any authority formed by man, is too painful to listen to or even read.

Men have always combined and used all the power they could command to oppress whatever living creature they could find ignorant of the means of defence, it is therefore, absurd, to suppose that a system of teaching would be encouraged to enlighten the oppressed. The object of teaching, is derived from one general motive, that is, to cultivate desires, which experience is constantly revealing to be extravagant. Human beings are driven to despair, by reason of their desires being cultivated beyond the natural method of gratification. There is no question but that men of learning know all about this imposition upon humanity, but are too timid to denounce the fraud.

Every principle in Nature is eagerly grasped to satisfy the greed of man, and can anyone pretend with a degree of candor that the higher class of society, so called, are at all interested in promoting the welfare of common humanity. These people are not ignorant of the necessity of controlling every avenue that will disturb their power. Hence, the mass of people must be deceived by confounding the form of knowledge with the real, and an advantage is taken of the natural desire to learn to protect the system of society. The brotherhood of mankind is spoken of to incite the ambition, when experience only will disclose the fraud.

Civilization is also pointed out to show the great advantage that is derived from a system of teaching. Now, development, and all growth pertaining to the welfare of humanity, is derived from the sense of freedom that every being must possess, who is conscious. The sense of

liberty cannot be taught, it is an inspired right, and were this right conditioned upon being taught by others, such a being, equally human, could not do so without exposing their own liberty, and disposition also, to deprive others of their natural power.

The liberty to learn or seek knowledge, is inconsistent with a dependence upon a teacher, particularly when the teacher must necessarily be able to determine what shall be taught. It can be claimed that liberty is a mere sentiment, and all action is dependent upon some influence. If so, by what power can a teacher, decide what is right to be taught? If this decision is derived from influence also, what particular office is the human mind designed to fill? Surely liberty must be admitted, or the responsibility of action rests with influence, and to punish a person for being influenced beyond this control, would be a positive injustice. Having decided in one's own mind what the liberty of action really means, can it not be seen that the general principle of teaching obstructs natural development, and also admits of the possibility of destroying the sense of liberty, even if the object taught makes a brilliant parade as an automaton?

The equal rights of all may be written upon paper Constitutions, from which a republican form of government derives its authority, but the very fact that a form of language must be established to teach people they possess these rights, proves by the act itself that equal rights are impossible. That is to say, equal rights, derived from the sense of liberty, to act according to individual conception, would not need to be taught if such equality was admitted. Besides, it can be readily seen by a man who is not trained to an automatic line of thinking, that the principle of teaching is so dependent upon language, as to make a pure motive depend upon an honest method of conveying sense conceptions. A quibble in language would surely betray

a scheme to benefit, other than the taught. Of course, this is meant to apply to the teaching of ethics—rules of human duty. It can readily be seen how ridiculous it is to use a fraudulent language, to teach innocent ignorance, rules of human duty. Can man establish a form to justify the correctness of any particular shape? How can a man use the light to see how it was produced?

Language is the first principle by which commerce is possible, and the disposition in man to grow, is but the desire for knowledge. It is not strange, therefore, that man's natural desire should make him oppressive. History shows how persistent man has always been in enslaving his fellowmen, and as language is the only method by which this injustice could be excused, or apparently justified, it will account for the present confusion in which language is defined in the dictionary. The most simple ideas are presented obtrusely by the double meaning of words. It can be readily claimed, that no living person is to blame for this fraud in the standard dictionary. But the man who would hide behind it, to benefit himself, would be as guilty as he who compiled it.

There is no equality that can be derived from the use of a language, that even scholars are constantly explaining in which sense a word is used. For instance, we are all equal and unequal also, when language expresses it as follows: We are unequally endowed with life. We are all equally dependent upon life. Now this will merely show that both sentences could convey a sense of right and wrong both. The convenience of talking in such a manner as to convey a double meaning, cannot possibly possess any virtue in a moral sense. No person can satisfy their own conscience of personal honesty, when they study the means to dispute their own assertions. A man will say he knows a circumstance has occurred, and when he is shown carefully that nothing of the kind has occurred, he

merely offers the excuse, "Oh, I am innocent, for I was *informed* it was so."

To crowd a dispute beyond the acknowledgement of being both right and wrong, will generally arouse angry feelings, and terminate in a personal raking of previous records to convince a person of what their own act shows they could not have committed without knowing 'it. It would seem, therefore, that the desire to be as unequal as possible, increased with the knowledge of playing with words. The power to deceive, seems to convince people of scholarly ability, that such power is right until it can be successfully overcome. In other words, the scholar, or to be more exact, the lexicographer, would laugh in ridicule for an illiterate person to question his authority. Yet in words of some character are we all equally dependent in the expressing of our ideas.

What can be more absurd, than to claim for one's self, to be a benefactor of mankind by depriving the illiterate of the knowledge of how it is done. Is there any difference between a white idea or a red one ; or between a white lie and a black one ?

Hence, if we consider the equality of beings to consist of their natural existence, it may be seen that cultivation and knowledge are the features from which the differences among men widen rather than diminish. No one who is honest in his sympathy for the misfortunes of others, can claim that a man is free to be taught what freedom is. Whoever is either compelled, or voluntarily submits to being taught human duty, is a slave. The fact of a person being contented and apparently happy, has nothing to do with the right and wrong of the matter.

Nature surrounds mankind with every variety of elements. If the element of force, which every living thing has an equal right to possess, by reason of its being forced upon them, equally protected such beings, no such

feature as freedom of action would be possible. It is, therefore, all wrong for a person to teach that which was taught to him, and call it right, when the freedom necessary to do it proves it to be wrong. Upon the clear understanding of the principle of freedom, the right of man equally rests. If Nature showed any partiality between the crude element or the refined, it can be seen in reference to man, that in his action, termed freedom, he would be irresponsible. Thus man, and every ethical sentiment denies its own argument when punishment is preached to him who is also taught what his duty is. The punishment contradicts the teaching, for if a man must be punished for doing wrong, he should have also the individual privilege to decide for himself whether it was wrong. However inconsistent Nature seems to be toward man, it does not discriminate between the one or the other. She does not compel a person to do wrong, and then punish him for it.

The law of force is the equal right of man to use according to his sense of reason. He is not responsible for what he is ignorant of, for knowledge must precede responsibility, as much so as space must exist before an object could occupy it. No man can determine what is right for another, because he possesses a greater degree of the phenomena of force. The mere experience will not in reason justify the use of force in depriving the weaker person from the exercise of what little they do possess. The rules of argument are so biased by the double meaning of words, that if it was not for the wise provision of reason, man would not take the trouble to teach obedience to greater power, but would proceed to exert it.

The force of knowledge is not anterior to the force from which knowledge is derived. It does not in any sense establish any authority to restrain the action of an element, of which it has no power to define. The man of the most profound knowledge, is a subject of the uncer-

tainties surrounding him, as much so as the most ignorant brute. A brick from a building will strike the brain profusely stored with knowledge, while a drunken vagabond, at the feet of the man thus struck, be spared. It merely shows that the character of force does not show any partiality ; we are equally uncertain of what is in store for us ; and if the man of knowledge cannot protect himself from the uncertainty of force, he surely cannot teach another that knowledge is pre-eminent to natural force.

Whichever way we turn, the effort of man to supersede himself, is the strife of life. He first becomes interested in the imitation of Nature. He is astonished when he accomplishes more than he expected ; he fails only when his vanity gets the better of his reason, and the brilliancy of imagination becomes so illuminating to his senses, as to cause him to believe he can catch up with his own shadow. Reason, the regulator of the will force, will not accompany the thoughts beyond the source from which the power is derived. The mere piling up of the shapes and forms that the art of man has conceived, is more the record of man's vanity than wisdom. With our boasted knowledge, we cannot determine what a spider thinks of us. We magnify his brain to see if it has any reasoning power, of which it is quick to exhibit, if greater force does not obstruct its line of escape.

It is doubtless humiliating to such persons as have illuminated their power of imagination, to be compared to a spider. We have classed it in the order of beings as an insect possessing life and instinct enough to flee from danger. But we expose our folly in trying to persuade the nature of things to fit the terms we give them. To define what was meant by the term, instinct, several volumes could be written, for all the languages would have to be searched. Various translations would have to be compared. Angry disputes would arise, when it would

doubtless be settled that instinct was the sense of being, and the sense of being was instinct.

The man who desires to be the equal of a spider, must first exercise his instinct according to his own sense, for he no sooner accepts the influence that is ever surrounding him than he ceases to be himself. He would soon know less than a spider, and would be forsaken by his trainer as danger appeared. If this is not in accord with what we so often hear, it is no less the right to assert it, than to give double meanings to words to make the power of man to oppress each other appear right. Whatever there may be to guide and control the force of Nature, it will never be words which are obliged to possess two meanings. That this is a fact every scholar must see. It matters not how crude or unseemly this writing may appear. Examine for yourself and see the studied method in the dictionary to make the force of book knowledge equal to the eternal force of Nature.

IMAGINATION.

CHAPTER IX.

Imagination is the smoke of reality. It is the vapor of our ideas, it expresses the transition of reality, to reality again. Like water that expands into vapor, and then condenses into water. Also, it is analogous to smoke for the same reason, for smoke is the result of the struggle between fuel and fire, or heat, even, which is only a degree of fire. The lighter, or more expansive that vapors become, the more active they are until meeting cooler elements, they are forced back to the earth to mingle again with their source.

It is impossible to define words, because they are the particles, which, being blended together, form the smoke, or vapor. The word, merely calls attention to the reality, by means of the sense of imagination. The word, animal, will convey to one mind the imagery of a cat, to another, a dog, and so on, it possesses no force to establish either. It takes a word to define a word, when the word used in definition calls for a continuous definition. To define, calls for a limit, yet, there is no limit, and scholars doubtless understand this principle. Sound and form are the elements of words. We possess no sense of them superior to the individual force to utter, and by the same means we give them shape.

It may be seen, therefore, that it is impossible to define a word, and their only value is to convey mind expressions. It is as impossible to convey ideas, as to

define words, and, because we are constantly trying to do both, it is no evidence that we do it. In a strict sense, nothing is taught by the mere learning of words; an utterance derived from pain, is as much a word, as the sound that we make in uttering the word man. The sense of imagination is the receptacle of whatever attracts attention. It may be from any of the defined senses. Whatever we see, makes an impression upon our minds, and causes an imagination—our ideas begin to smoke.

It is no part of the design of this writing to attempt any specific style of expression, for the right of utterance in any form has always been a universal one. The aim is to be understood, rather than to embrace eccentric methods. Every living being is odd, and only in smoke can we mingle in society. That is to say, we associate in imagination, but in our sense of being we are always odd. Visions are not conveyed to us, but instead, are reflected from an attraction from within.

Man will always be mistaken in his effort to convey knowledge by means of language. What he conveys is the vapor of his ideas—imagination—and in proportion to his understanding of this principle, is he happy or miserable. The choice, or free will, so termed, is only limited to the degree of knowledge, or experience, one possesses, and this choice is not optional with the man. That is, he must choose either good or evil, for to refuse to make a choice is death. It can be easily shown in words, that no one is free, but the sense of being is a fact; therefore, the only means we have to determine what we mean by freedom, is our senses.

Nothing is more imaginary than the idea of our duty being taught to us, it destroys the logical feature of being free. What can any one understand by being taught in a jumble of extravagant words, what a man is free to do? Can any one obtain a sense of freedom by being first tied

to a post, and then taught that freedom is only possible by cheerfully submitting to the bondage? The fact is, we are tempted to grow by the power of imagination. It is the activity of life, but we must get out of the smoke of our own fire, and also that which others kindle around us. Hence, our choice between right and wrong, is being constantly presented in smoke. Nature is so accommodating that we may choose the vapor of life, or the reality.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, by the rules of logic, that man is taught to choose imagination, by alluring promises, which are never realized beyond the excuse equally as smoky as the imagination in which the victim dwells. No one can choose prior to the sense of knowledge, and to be taught what is right, it must be derived from some one's experience. It is equivalent to binding the faculty of growth, for no one can deny the force of the logic, that in teaching a person what their duty is, it practically destroys the essential of life—the finding out by one's own experience. Nothing but the theory of natural depravity can justify the power of teaching rules of human duty. It is the privilege of every being to submit to this diction, but if he possesses the power of reason, he must be either free to exercise it, or else he is so inconsistent as to prefer the imagination to the reality.

Experience must always precede imagination, nothing can be taught except by a process of dissecting that which is real, or from prior experience. No one can have a correct idea of a dog, from an experience of seeing a table, and then be taught that a dog had four legs like a table, and a body and head like a man. Such a method is the only way in which the imagination can be reached. Ideal pictures of the mind can be re-arranged in endless fancy after an experience is effected, but whatever the mind pictures, it will be but the transposing of parts of that which experience has previously established.

All the efforts of man to reach beyond his experience fails to satisfy his reason. In fact, reason fails at the point where imagination begins, and he who cultivates this system of elevation, may become so illuminated by the brilliancy of his own light, as to imagine the whole earth belongs to him. He will feel rich in a poor-house, and if there is any virtue to the entire abandonment to the joy of imagination, it is in believing that others admire us as much as we do ourselves.

The fact that reason will not accompany our minds beyond that which we can actually sense, should teach us all the folly of speculation beyond that within our actual grasp. The sense of danger is cultivated from actual experience. No one would be so cruel as to push a child down, to teach it the danger of falling. Yet, we have only to observe the child, to learn more wisdom than we are able to teach. It begins to grow by struggling to get on its feet, and the principle deformities are derived from the presumption of the parents, who are over balanced with imagination themselves.

The principle of teaching is responsible for the abuse of mental phenomena ; if it was derived from a sense of brotherly love, it would be more excusably, but when we see the various connivances to deceive those ignorant of the means of defence, the inconsistency of mankind is complete. But a man will never rise, who falters at obstructions, for even were they purposely put in his path, he should never waste his time in complaining. Man obtains substantial elevation in proportion to his persistency in getting ahead and overcoming every variety of obstruction. The conscientious man will bear all that is packed on, and yet go higher than those who essay the ideas of others, and send them in smoke to meet a cool reception, only to return to the earth again completely flattened out.

Imagination is the constructive feature of the brain. It is closely allied to ambition; we must in a measure imagine an object before we are stimulated with the courage to advance. Growth depends upon this principle, and we are really pulled up by the vapor of our ideas. But the great question of life is involved in this principle, yet it seems so contradictory. The understanding of this necessary feature of the brain is absolutely confined to the brain that conceives the imagination. The confusion is in the measure of language rather than in the brain.

The imaginary picture of a horse is no less clear to a person's mind because he has no language to express his mind convictions. Also, if a very rude language is employed it merely fails to convey an idea of the picture. Besides, the expression employed could convey to the mind of another, that a cow was the real picture, and by the words used, the sense of imagination would reason from its conclusion that the picture of the mind should adjust itself to the interpretation another puts upon the language employed.

To bring these ideas more fully to the mind, our sense of imagination must be accepted as being embraced within the freedom of the will. No one can comprehend these ideas who has sold his birthright like Esau of old. The imaginations may so completely govern us that while we exercise our freedom in some particular, we are either firmly bound by the cultivation of some feature of imagination, or compelled to do what is far worse—suppress our honest opinions. The mind itself is the only power that can determine motives and objects, and only by a terrible struggle with one's own imagination can these facts be demonstrated. A moderation in speculative ideas is the secret of mind growth, for whereas imagination, like water, is an essential feature of growth, like water, it will drown a person as well as satisfy his thirst.

The excessive cultivation of desire is the most direct method of increasing the imagination beyond the mind's control. The ethical systems are so filled with the selfishness and greed of man that no standard of written authority will stand the test of the reasoning faculties of the brain. A man can submit, and learn obedience ; he can follow in ignorance of his own power the same as a horse obeys his master. Minor desires are satisfied, but the growth of a being is obstructed by a system of education that pretends to establish facts by the analyzing of imagination.

It seems hardly necessary to caution the reader not to apply rules to this writing, that would just as surely condemn himself. Every being can measure his own ideas, or imaginations even, or they are not entitled to be so termed. A light that does not illuminate itself ceases to be a light. Therefore, when a man can detect readily the mistakes of others, he must bear in mind, that only by the medium of language can he form such conclusions. To follow one's thought still farther it may be seen that the fault can as easily be in the measure as in the object measured. It is much easier, which can only be determined by experience, to find words to excuse one's own fault and condemn the ideas of others, than to analyze in words their own thoughts, or express their sense of being.

It makes no difference in what form ideas are painted, the facts that the sense of being conveys to one's self, stands out beyond, and reaches higher, than the words or characters by which the mere attempt is made to express them. In the effort of man to overreach his sense of being, imagination plays the most prominent part. We endeavor to re-arrange our mind pictures which are reflected from actual facts, and establishing a superior order from which we indulge our imagination to believe they are facts also. Pictures from imagination disclose the fancy of the mind.

Probably no one in sound sense believes any human being to have ever seen an angel, or a human form with wings, in actual motion. Now the fact that pictures of human forms with wings are painted to represent them in motion, proves clearly that some mind has in imagination distinctly formed these angels. It is also quite probable that the mind can conceive a motion to these figures, but every one who experiences mind pictures, can determine by the same power he conceives them, whether he can as readily give them motion as he can form or shape.

This absence of motion should convey a hint to the mind of its own superiority over its conceptions. The power of the mind is able to transmit its pictures by either sound or the ability to form things, but the inability to transmit the power of volition, shows the limit to man's creative power. Besides all the imaginations of man which are displayed in pictures, show them to be but transpositions of parts of real existence; the same as angels are given the wings of birds to give them the appearance of flying.

It is the disposition to progress that excessive imagination is indulged in, but the physical danger is well known, yet the written language of man is so tinctured with the smoke of imagination, that the mind of the student is more liable to be destroyed than it is to detect the fraud. Civilization is not the result of dishonesty, and every physician well knows how Nature treats the human body when the mind becomes more engaged in imagination than the reality of things. If imagination is superior to reality, what are the results? The theories of man are always condensed back to the reality from which they vaporized.

All arguments of words can be controverted, and the reason is simple enough. Words are the imagery of facts, and the struggles of all the learned men of which history

records, shows how persevering men have worked to give their imaginations life. Man's conceit of himself will not permit of acknowledging this fraud in words, after he has enjoyed the exclusive advantage that is derived from the deceit. The imitation scholar can have no idea what this writing means. Such will laugh at any ideas beyond their own measure. But all the men or women who have developed their minds by overcoming the obstacles that imagination has presented, cannot deny to their own minds the facts from which these ideas are formed. The method of formation can be controverted or sneered at, but no one can place a fact upon paper, any more than a painter can paint an angel so perfect that it will fly off the canvas.

There is such pleasure in the imagination that a man is in constant danger of being controlled by it, and every person of sense knows very well that when imagination is indulged in preference to the reality, insanity takes place. No one, however, can determine the degree of insanity in another for the simple reason that those who are really insane always betray a perfect confidence in their own sanity. A person will struggle while in doubt, but to become convinced of the reality of a vision, or the vaporizing of a mind picture into a fact, is to be hopelessly bound. No development or progress can possibly take place until a doubt is re-established. Hence, to possess a metaphysical understanding of imagination one should see that it merely excited the mind in an object to be sought. We can only pry into the future by means of these vaporized pictures, and our peace of mind depends upon the realization, or real experience, which satisfies the mind of the danger of following the smoke of one's own ideas.

The gas in a balloon will pull a person up from the earth, but it can be scientifically accounted for, also the

volatility of one's thought can far exceed the flight of the balloon, the individual only can determine whether he will let go of the reality of things and be pulled up by the vapor of his own ideas. It therefore depends upon a realization of our mind pictures before we build upon our imaginations. That is to say, we must experience the reality of our own mind vision before we advance, or build upon our visions until we lose sight of the reality from which they were vaporized.

In imagination man forgets that he is already created. He will develop in proportion to his ability to overcome his surroundings. Man makes no worse failure than in trying to control them for the very development of man depends upon the severity of the obstructions he overcomes. The imitator is only successful as such, he may ride to Heaven upon the coat tail of another man, but he is always left outside with the coat.

Words are merely a form of language, and the English words have vaporized to such an extent, that if care is not taken by the individual mind they will be led into the chambers of imagination before the experience of things scarcely occurs. It is in the effort to make words the equal of knowledge that man has most signally failed. Their relative character is well known to the scholar, but in whatever a person is ignorant of, it is just as much a blank, as his own existence was before he was born. Hence to deceive an ignorant man is a crime without an equal. History is a standing record for man to study to see if he can find any period of the past, when the learned men, so-called, ever showed any sympathy for crude humanity. Now this is very significant when we consider how helpless creatures have been, and are now, for no crime other than being born ignorant.

There is no authority for words, the knowledge of which is doubtless well known. But the power of imagina-

tion will justify its own imagery, and reason is only reasonable to those who have the same sense of justice towards others as they have for themselves. It is therefore to the reasonable only, that these lines appeal. Examine the facts, and satisfy your own minds whether logic and reason are myths, to be overcome by the mere smoke of our ideas. You well know there is no authority for words that equals that from which language is derived. The authority, so-called, is as visionary as the words—the mere pictures of imagination—no less so than the painted angels.

The disposition of the learned to oppress the ignorant is only possible by the power of words, yet they are no sooner taught than they become a witness against those who connived them. Let us be honest to ourselves and use the same logic against ourselves as we can so ably use against others. Theology is the science of imagination, and the term theology as applied to religion, is analogous to words applied to language. This science rests firmly upon the theory of natural depravity. It cannot stand the logic of reason if the hypothesis of depravity in human nature can be shown to be false. It is false upon the principle of charity toward the ignorant, for their character should be spotless until natural depravity is proved to be true. This has taxed the most learned men for ages, and it yet remains an open question. Justice to the defenceless demands that the ignorant masses are held guiltless until they are proved guilty. What have the learned men of the present day to say in regard to the teaching of words to children that are purposely arranged to defend the hypothesis of natural depravity, when history so plainly shows the motive to have been servitude.

To make words the equal of what they represent, deception must be practiced. Words to be true must be as true as language, or the reality which they express. How is this accomplished? The definition of words bearing

upon theology all have a double definition. Examine Webster's dictionary for yourself. There can be only one purpose for this double dealing—to confound the understanding and justify the false charge of depravity upon helpless humanity. It is child's play for a scholar to rebut an argument when he has enough meanings for the words he uses. But Nature does more for humanity than man for man. She permits mankind in the consistency of reason, to be free to choose between right and wrong. Knowledge must take place before a sense of this privilege can occur.

The reason is simple why men of learning prey upon the ignorant. They possess the power, but what such men have to account for, is the pretence of kindness toward those who are so ignorant that they must first be taught of their depravity. If men admit by their own acts a willingness to teach words to disguise their desire for being served, surely the term natural depravity should be changed to acquired depravity. For in the true sense of reason the man who is wicked and knows it, is far more guilty than he who is even ignorant of the charge made against him.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

CHAPTER X.

The evils of educational systems can only be understood by a sincere conception of what education means. Because it is a simple matter to warp the minds of others by a system of teaching, it is far from settling the ever disputed question of what is right or wrong.

Like all questions of interest to humanity, the individual must either settle it for himself, or sacrifice his inherent right to the freedom of will. Teaching would be impossible if the human mind was not poised between right and wrong. The science of teaching is founded upon the power to teach, for the right to teach is always secondary to the power to enforce the teaching. A force of some character must be applied from without before teaching is possible, and the right to teach, or what to teach, can only be determined by the reasonableness of the individual mind. For whatever else may be considered collectively, the human reason is as individual as his body. The voluntary assent to being taught is as impossible as to decide whether to be born or not. Hence the teacher is responsible for whatever inherent right is destroyed in the mind of another.

An honest reasoner cannot show a consistent reason for teaching, without destroying by the same line of argument, the universally acknowledged freedom of the will. It is also a known fact to every individual who ever sensed an individual action of their own, that freedom

or liberty is the power to act, and if such liberty is conditional to the effect that action derived from such liberty is only right when it did not interfere with anyone else, the inconsistency must be apparent. This rule would condemn the right to teach, for as a principle of interference with the inherent rights of others, it leads all other methods of oppression that mankind bears from each other.

There is no such thing as free will if the right to teach is derived from the power to teach, for nothing could be more inconsistent than to teach to a supple being that he was free to be taught what he was free to do. Equivalent to saying that a man was free to jump into the water, if he could do it without displacing any water. It is the same as saying to our own kind, we will teach you the science of free will, if you will serve us as slaves ever after. It is the old trick derived from the devil: "Recognize my power, mortgage yourself to me, and then you will be *free* to proclaim that you *own* the property."

No man or woman can reason justly to themselves until they decide who they belong to. It is not comfortable to live in a mortgaged house, unless a person is better satisfied with appearances than the reality of things. Hence, to understand this writing without prejudice, one must decide whether they are the property of another or not. The mere boy who can read, would say at once, that a man who was willing to be a slave, would not only be willing that others should be, but he would do all he could to make them slaves. Such is the force of reason. It is equally true that he who discovers he is free, can never in reason be so inconsistent as to rob others by teaching them they were free to serve him.

The science of education is confounded with knowledge, and while the prejudiced mind would pervert this writing to give it the appearance of being an attack upon

the development of humanity, the man possessing real charity for the defenceless beings ignorant of their inherent right, would see at once that real knowledge was defended, against the counterfeit.

The desire to find out what is right is inherent in human nature. The man who progresses beyond what is taught, the mere custom of things, will learn as his first lesson that depravity or wickedness was derived from his teaching. He desires above all things to be able to discern quickly between right and wrong. Experience alone will show the impossibility of learning this secret from others and no better proof, to the man who is willing to reason, can be had, than to observe that the most learned men are in constant strife over this simple question. Simple, because a man can so easily decide it by his own experience. Complexed, because a man tries to find a reasonable system by which he can teach others what is right, that will at the same time excuse him for acting as he chooses himself. Power can merely enforce the appearance of a right. It can silence the throbbing desire to learn the right. It can prevent the innocence of childhood from ever knowing the right, but to create a right, or teach what is right, power simply destroys itself.

The public school is generally looked upon as the very source of knowledge, and whoever dares to attack the system at the roots may be accorded a hero, but it will be after he is dead, for power only yields its grip when it encounters superior power. No man can attack a great wrong to society, without first being willing to sacrifice himself, and bear cheerfully the sneers and persecutions of the world. The reward can only be found in the self-consciousness of performing a duty fearlessly.

Learned men admit by their own writings that they as a class have always opposed the administering of what is termed knowledge, to the masses or general public.

While there are doubtless a great many learned men who are striving to benefit humanity, very few can be found that will sacrifice any personal desire to accomplish it. Hence, the public schools are known to be imperfect, but men of ability are striving hard to prove that the good in them overbalances the evil. Doctors bury their mistakes, and the fact that the mistakes of the public schools are buried also, makes the right or wrong of the system very difficult to prove.

Both the scholar and illiterate are agreed upon the importance of education, in fact, all are willing to grow just as soon as the possibility is discovered. There is also more proof, that man in his individual capacity, is more willing to grow than he is to permit any one else to. That is to say, the growth of man is a fixed eternal fact, and only from the individual conceit derived from the freedom of the will, is it possible for a man to assume any authority in the premises. Nature is not so remiss in her duty as to leave the growth of mankind to the tender mercies of each other, while she so ably screens herself from the prying wit of man to discover from whence her power. The fact is, every learned man knows that every human being is inspired with a desire to learn, and learn they will, in spite of all opposition. Education in its true sense, is growth, it is inspiration, it is never taught.

The inconsistency of man in pretending to be anxious to elevate his fellowmen, by teaching them, is very clear when we hear the same man exclaim against those who differ with him, because they know too much. The great trouble of society, at present, is the fact that the masses of humanity know too much, they make too much trouble for the exclusive class of people, who are always ready to be let alone if all their wants are supplied. Now, if it is a fact that the people know too much, the object of the public schools is either specific, or they are to instruct the

the rising generation to know less. Perhaps it would be well for some philosopher or scientist to explain how a child can be taught to carry a light in the dark, or how a child can be taught obedience to another person, who shows by their example an utter indifference to any authority. It is impossible to put weapons of defence into the hands of beings competent to use them, who can also be kept ignorant of their power to defend themselves.

The public schools embrace the principle of right and wrong both, the great question is which predominates. It is very inconsistent for a person to urge the necessity of teaching, and also hold that the right or wrong of a matter depends upon its own action. Surely such an argument contradicts the necessity to teach anything, and the man who advocates the necessity of it as the means of development, merely exposes his personal desire to profit by the system. A man may be called a lunatic for denouncing the system of public instruction, but what can be said of a system that is obliged to disguise its real motive by teaching words that must necessarily possess two meanings to show the need of their being taught? What can be said of a man who enjoys the luxuries of human toil, when he merely exclaims "educate?" What does he mean? A boy can point at the sun and command it to shine, and man may assume authority over Nature, but she gives no evidence of being disturbed. Hence, what is education? Why are people so ready to proclaim education and immediately take offence if they are asked for an explanation. Such are astonished at the ignorance of one who would ask for a definition of the term, education, but they would need to be told, probably, that every one chases ignorance as they do their shadow.

The term, education, embraces that which is learned, and that which is taught. Will any reasonable man claim there is no difference in teaching and learning? For up-

on this difference the authority for public schools rests. It has been observed before, but it can never be written too often, that the double meanings given to words cannot possibly be for any other purpose than to make the teachings by man equal, in appearance at least, to the inspiration of knowledge that beats in every human breast.

How can man determine what is right to teach a child, when he is unable to answer its questions? The very first step in teaching is to confine the questions of a child to a limit, or practically admit deceit upon the start, and either cripple the understanding of the child or give it such a confusion of ideas as to develop the desires that deceit only will satisfy. But what has this to do with public schools? Let us be honest and let our experience sit in judgment over our follies. If we discover that our progress in life was due to our efforts in removing the obstructions surrounding us, why will we deceive our own children by teaching them what we know by our own experience to have been an obstruction.

Noah Webster spent ten years of his life in search for the origin of words. Many of the ablest men of the world have spent their lives in search of origins. It is evident from the dictionary itself that Webster wasted his time in the search, for the origin is yet in dispute beyond the mere fact of words being the outcome of language without being the language. In the same sense that a piece of chalk will make a mark without altering the character of the chalk.

Language is the base line by which the commerce of ideas are transmitted. It is as much the result of the desire to communicate as breathing is derived from the desire to live. Language in its true sense is never taught, Hence, it is forms that are taught, mere words; and the effort of the learned men to hide their own iniquity must have been well known to Webster, or he could not have covered the deceit in words in so able a manner.

From the present effort to teach the forms of facts is where the corruption of the public school system lies. A clear definition of words is not given because it will disturb the exclusive privileges so long enjoyed by the learned. The desire to teach others is no more than the natural conceit of man to make a display of what he knows. The learned are not ignorant of this matter, for if they were they would not be so particular about the form in which the ideas of others were presented. The extreme effort to teach in our public schools, the degradation of illiteracy is much more noticable than the importance of being honest. Not but that honesty is encouraged, and even dwelt upon as being important, but the scholar who has the courage to learn more than is taught him, will discover that it is the appearances that are taught, while to be really honest he must learn something himself. He discovers that honesty cannot be demonstrated, or extracted from a fraud.

It is not the purpose of this writing to reflect personally upon any man by assuming a motive for what he advocates. It is the simplest thing in the world for a man to be deceived about others, and also we are all surrounded with the influence of our teaching or training. The special effort to sustain particular systems of education, should arouse the suspicions of the thinking man. It is not the man that knows he is guilty that commits himself by recognizing a charge against him, but the men who are taught to defend him, will repeat the words he is taught without regard to what they mean. The man who undertakes to defend a fraud will expose himself much more positive than anyone can do it for him. It is therefore important for man to sustain his authority which relieves him, for the time, from the responsibility of his act. It at least makes the appearances of things seem correct.

If the learned men who have the directing of the public schools are sincere it would not in any sense dam-

age their dignity by answering such simple questions as these. Why should the innocence of childhood be taught that knowledge was both experience and information? Why are words taught to be truths, when we all know they are the most convenient means in the world to tell lies with? Is barbarism any worse than a dishonest measure of words for the avowed purpose of protecting civilization?

We are taught by philologists that what is meant by the word barbarism is, an uncivilized state, a state of cruelty, any form of speech contrary to the pure idioms of a particular language. This word bears the same deceptiveness that betrays a studied motive. The double definition condemns the philologist equally with those he would reflect upon. What are "pure idioms of a particular language?" Who has authority to establish idioms? And when such idioms are purposely arranged to deceive the innocent and teach them it is right for learned men to be served, in exchange for teaching these particular idioms. Who is more barbarous or cruel than the learned men who would pretend to establish a "pure idiom" to elevate themselves upon an equal plane with the eternal existence of things? Is it possible that civilization is the result of this stupendous fraud? Are not barbarians in their simple innocence the peers of men who would teach words to be language, and establish idioms for the very purpose of justifying a service from their own kind, who are rewarded with a hope for justice after death, but in life must bear the stigma of being barbarians. Men may justify their own conscience by thus deceiving the innocent. They may teach that it is a crime to be ignorant of one's own "depravity," but it will never add to the virtue of those who possess the knowledge of their own wickedness.

Little children are taught in the public schools, and by the common consent of their parents that illiteracy is


a degradation, The homes of the rich are pointed out as being obtainable by a careful attention to the forms of expression, and thus stimulated, the hope of wealth, and what they look upon in youth as being "perfectly splendid," inspires their ambition to learn from whoever can win their confidence. The extravagant idioms that are taught in the public schools, and paid for by the toil of the very men, who, because they are illiterate, and laughed at for not knowing better, are a reproach to the principles upon which this government is supposed to rest.

This very effort of teaching the forms of things to be equal to the reality, betrays the fears of the exclusive class of people that knowledge will become too common. People are innocently deceived, and made to contribute to a system, because they were trained to do so. Such are as innocent as the unborn, for when the imagination prevails over the reality of things, reason is destroyed. Logic to such people is like darkness to a light, they merely follow the groove, for which they were trained. Human nature to such minds is vulgarity, merely because they were taught so. These well known facts are merely to show the inconsistency in pretending that idioms are taught only as the means to enable the pupil to develop its own freedom. But if it is a fact that the influence of teaching controls the action of the mind, the absurdity of teaching people what to think, as an assistance to the discovery of the equal right of all humanity to think what they have a mind to, must be apparent.

Words are but the measures of language, the inspiration of which is bestowed upon every living thing. Man and language were created, or always existed in common, it matters not which, for the purpose of this writing. Words are the connivance of man which cannot be hidden to the honest observer. The same audacity that would swell the conceit in man to believe himself to be the equal

of his creator, is the source of the effort to teach words to be language. Nature may be denounced with violent words but she acts undisturbed, and when a man can teach that his own works are equal to his own structure, he destroys his pupil in proportion to the confidence reposed. If this is right, and man also possesses a free will which gives him the power to do it, no one can teach without admitting by the very act, that the teaching is wrong.

If it is right to teach, it is surely wrong to teach deception. There are two different objects in the principle of teaching, one is to furnish the means of a mutual exchange of ideas or mind impressions, the other is the much mooted question of natural depravity. In both cases it is pretended to be for the interest of the taught. Now it is just as natural for beings to have intercourse as to possess an appetite, it is the desire to seek food rather than the food exciting the desire. It is, therefore, just as reasonable, that the same men who would enslave their kind, compelling them by chains and whips to furnish food for their masters, would not hesitate to so arrange the measure of language, as to deceive their victims. If we are indebted for words, it is to the very men who would rob the mother of her child, and gorge himself with luxury from the sale of it. Surely the arrangement of words was never conceived from the desire to enlighten humanity. It would seem more reasonable when the character of the ancients are carefully studied, that words were for the purpose of disguising the wickedness of the learned in the pretense of teaching the illiterate a delusive hope upon the supposition they were born wicked. Nothing is more common in human nature than the effort of the vicious to teach virtue. Hence, it seems fair to conclude, that men who would enslave their kind, would also deceive them.



A sincere person must be consistent, therefore, when a simpler method of measuring language is even possible, it should be the proof of his sincerity to candidly admit, if it was right to teach children, the shortest road to perfection would be the best. The commerce in corn is guarded by a government standard of measure, it secures a just exchange, but in the exchange of mind pictures we have no measure of words that will distinguish between the real and the counterfeit. The learned demand a just measure to buy corn, but in the matter of words, they prefer to enjoy exclusive luxury by means of words which are entirely beyond the comprehension of the common people to measure. The character of corn would not be changed whether measured in a tin or wooden measure, neither does the means of expressing an idea effect the idea.

Public schools can only be justified by a mutual privilege, for all classes, and the principle of teaching words or the measures of language should be equally protected with the measure of merchandise. Who would think of giving a child four quarts of corn for a peck and blame the child for not knowing the difference. Yet words are taught to the same child that apply to reality and imagination with equal force, and the confused child, is merely told that the difference will be readily seen when it becomes as learned as the teacher.

This matter is very simple if it is honestly considered, for if the public schools are more for the profit of teaching and justifying the oppression of the poor, the avowed purpose of enlightening humanity is a fraud. On the other hand, if the public schools are to teach the means by which the social relations of life may be harmonious, a measure of language should be established and protected by the same government, that enforces a tax upon the people to support these schools. The innocent children and victim-

ized parents, are at the mercy of the learned class. These in turn are supported or persecuted by the rich, their personal ease is considered first, they have the same prescription for all social evils: "The masses must be educated." Yet the educated are driven by hunger to serve the very man they were taught to look upon as being vulgar. It makes no difference how much knowledge a man has if he is thoroughly taught to despise all those who cannot measure language with himself, he will oppress the poor with the hypocritical pretense of assisting them. Society can only be improved by the fearless courage of those who dare to express their honest opinions.

People are not taught to think in our public schools, it is only by experience that we sense our thoughts. Hence, it must be seen by those who are guilty, even if their circumstances demands an indifferent notice of the iniquity around them. What is taught in the public schools is what to think, and when the feeble minds search the dictionary for an expansion of their thoughts, they only discover a limit, for by the book itself there is no appeal from words. All teachers are schooled to this same line. Hence, the dictionary speaks in words, and declares itself to be the final limit of human knowledge. This cannot be disputed by even a subterfuge in words, for the dictionary must define the meaning of its own name even, and declare itself autocratic—absolute. It defines the word, define, as the limit. This of itself betrays a motive to deceive the student in his primary efforts to obtain knowledge. No one need be deceived about this matter, and learned people may sneer at its minor importance. They may also wrap their mantle of power around their dignity of silence, but facts will exist after they are dead. A chipmunk squirrel can command more real respect than the man who struts along in dignified silence with a consciousness of deceit in his heart.

Such is the character of Webster's dictionary. It is with no disposition to reflect upon the honesty of Professor Webster, but nevertheless, his great production is false at heart. The dictionary is the greatest "task master" the world has ever had to bear, and the reason is because it defends and justifies the barbarious custom of human beings enslaving each other. This is no mere assertion for the book bears witness against itself. Learned men know this fact, but have not the courage to denounce it. It can only be discovered by the simple minds that escape the "chain and whip" of the public schools.

No idolator ever walked the earth that outranks the worshiper of words. The dictionary calls such, "a pagan." He is worse, he deceives the innocence of childhood by destroying the natural ability, and offering in its place a system of words, declaring to the credulous child that words are knowledge, and then disputing it by saying that knowledge is experience. It is convenient for a thief to have two names, but if the public schools are what we are to depend upon to maintain our "free institutions," it can only be accomplished by an honest measure of words.

The origin of words and man are identical, and they both reflect the duplicity of each other. Man tries to prove he is superior to everything else. In his power of imagination he accomplishes the wonderful feat of discovering how he was made out of nothing. It worked well so long as he could make any one believe it. Hence, words are a great convenience, but they must also have the appearance at least of being superior to their source—the language from which they were necessarily formed. The simile is perfect. Man presents the figure of his maker modeled after himself. Also to make words the equal of thoughts it is necessary to reason backward in the same manner. Man pretends to make an acknowledged superior, but cannot conceive of a model, superior to

himself. Words also, to make the delusion more secure, or give them a consistent appearance to serve the authority of man, must be the models of thought in the same manner as man is the model of his God. To accomplish this feat the wit of man was taxed to its utmost. It would not answer to simply teach the ignorant that words were derived from thoughts, for they would soon learn how to make words to suit themselves. Greed and the devil were always in partnership, they concocted the scheme to make a dictionary and give all words that would expose their wickedness two meanings. The convenience is doubtless apparent to the learned who style themselves lawyers. If a man is called to account for using particular words, he appeals to the definition which answers his purpose best, and the dictionary seals the fraud by defining the word, define, "final—the limitation of search."

It is very interesting to observe the definition of the word, final—"limit, end," besides it "pretains to the end;" and to make the confusion complete the third clause reads—*Respecting the purpose or ultimate end in view*. Surely it must be necessary to keep the learned in luxurious seclusion to keep this "cat in the bag" so long. The children who are slaughtered in the public schools are not given a thought, compared to the effort to protect the teaching of this stuff. The children are sacrificed to maintain the greed of man. Learned men can well pretend to benefit humanity by managing the public schools. The double meaning of words protects them from an assault of words, but gentlemen, Nature will outwit you as she has your kind in the past, for if the innocent children who are sent to a premature grave are speechless, your very acts will be your own destruction. You cannot put weapons into the hands of your servants, or slaves, except they also learn how to defend themselves.

POLITICAL DECEPTION.

CHAPTER XI.

The term, politics, is defined — the science of government. It applies to a system to protect the power of an exclusive society in the government of society in general. This system is a wall to prevent the direct influence of the people, acting upon the wheels of state. It is the diabolical scheme to deceive all the people. First, to deceive all those who are ignorant of the means of defense. Second, to so control the natural desire for knowledge as to dictate the public school system, in the interest of political deception.

Politics, wealth, and theology, are a trio in mutual embrace. Wealth and theology forms the two ends of politics, like the necessary two ends of a bridge. It must bear all the approaches, and also screen the various devices by which wealth and theology fleece the industrious people. First, by teaching the righteousness of wealth, for the purpose of stimulating a greater production. Second, by robbing the production, and by the convenience of politics, to so control the government, as to legalize this fraud into the appearance of being a right. Neither wealth or theology have any respect for politics, but it is the most practical method the devil has yet suggested to both rob the people and teach them a willingness to be robbed.

The fact that the development of man is due to the birth of new ideas, makes it an easy matter for those more forward to deceive the more ignorant. This is called

education. It is derived from every variety of influence, but the great incentive is the natural desire to learn. The learned make a logical exposure of what their intentions are by striving so hard to cover the track of previous methods. They must pretend to benefit the ignorant, or their own pride would not be sufficient to sustain their iniquity.

This can only apply to those who possess the knowledge of scheming to defraud the equal rights of common humanity. The mere presumption of being learned will only apply to specific ideas, for one could be learned to steal until a self-justification would be to such a mind just as strong as to him who would lose his self-respect by committing a similar act. Hence, to get a clear idea of what this writing means, one must not judge others who have different surroundings, but examine themselves to determine what constitutes a learned man. It is folly to defend a learned man because he is called such, for there is no copyright upon the term, because all are learned in something at every stage of growth. It can also be seen to be important that the individual only, possesses the knowledge of his sincerity. He discovers from his own ideas what is right or wrong ; and to measure the sincerity of others, his own standpoint is his guide. But to continue this thought a little farther, a just reasoner will see that his volition of thought, is individual, and being such, his power to use this right does not extend beyond himself. He equally condemns himself with others, when he uses his right of judgment or reason, and then condemns all others for differing with the lines of thought he draws, by the very force of liberty he would deprive others of.

The principle of interference is governed by the reason only. Power is right only when an infallible reason can demonstrate it to be such. The absence of reason is always noticeable whenever a person endeavors

to justify an act by the power to perform it. Even if an act is of a metaphysical character, the right of the act must be derived from an infallible reason. The principle of right is not established or created in the sense that a form is merely a straight line out of shape. Right is infinite existence. The power to form things is the privilege of man ; it is his liberty, but no specific form or shape can possibly be accepted as, the form, the only form, or the right form. It is man's duty to discover what is right, and having done so by the only method that will satisfy his infallible reason, his experience, he is responsible to himself and all mankind for defying this knowledge, and deliberately performing a wrong act. Man's duty being so much more plainly revealed to himself, it should show as clearly how unreasonable it was to attempt even, to establish rules of duty to restrict the development of another.

The honesty of learned men in declaring a sympathy for the illiterate, is thoroughly exploded in logic by the severe service which is demanded for this sympathy. A man in reason could not claim to have any sympathy for a drowning man, whom he would rescue from the water and then demand a service, the rendering of which being refused, the real character of the sympathetic benefactor would appear by the robbing of the man he would pretend to save, and then telling him he could jump into the water again.

A sincere man in the absence of experience is just as ignorant of the deceptive character of others who may be equally trained in book knowledge. Were crooked trees animate or capable of sense conception, they would consider how they become bent, but they would, to reason as men do, exclaim at once, that the straight trees were neglected in their youth. Painful experience is what develops the mind of man to a clear understanding of the human character. Whatever may be the influence of books upon

the mind, either for good or bad, they disclose their relative character to human experience. It is only by the principle of analogy that book instruction is possible, and the pure mind which never conceived an experience of deceit, would be as ignorant as a stone of its existence, regardless of all the book knowledge he might possess. No one can question this principle, without admitting their ignorance. It is just as possible for book learned men to believe sincerely that civilization is derived from the knowledge or information imbedded in books, as for crooked trees to claim that straight trees were degraded, because they were shapeless.

Before the real necessity of a political system can be understood, it is important to examine the relation between the cultivated class of society and the crude class, the learned and the illiterate, the class in possession of knowledge, and the ignorant class. It has been shown that the absence of experience is the real base of ignorance, hence, an ignorant man is more susceptible of being deceived, than he who has tasted of the bitter and sweet both. It is a simple matter to entice a child with a stick of candy, after it is permitted to taste of it. The sight of a wooden stick painted will deceive the child until a taste also will reveal the deception. It is, therefore, more convenient for designing men to deceive the ignorant, than those of their own caliber. The ignorant man must first be taught that he is depraved, before he can form an idea of what it means. A dog is satisfied to be a dog; he would not exchange his head for that of a king.

There is no question but what a duty exists between man and man to assist each other, but will this principle justify a deceptive course toward those who are not so responsible for their ignorance as those who possess a positive knowledge of what is wrong. What is more de-

plorable than the effort of a learned man to take advantage of the ignorance of another, for the purpose of giving to himself the appearance of being elevated. The sneers at the brutish actions of the ignorant, and the scorn toward the illiterate, is but the display of vanity. No one can throw their harmless shaft at the innocence of the ignorant, without it reflecting their conceit. The ignorant possesses no idea of what is meant, and only to excite the applaud of vulgar vanity, will anyone sneer at the work of God to illuminate their conceit.

Civilization, growth, and education, are synonymous terms. They apply to a principle as absolute as gravitation, and instead of being incompatible with the freedom of the will, such freedom is proved by the learned effort to apply these terms to the work of man. In this deceit of man to lean his work against the eternal righteousness of things, his pretended assistance to the ignorant is exposed. No one would take the trouble to deal in the double meaning of terms, who was not either a taught victim, or a deliberate schemer. Hence, to disguise the injustice of pretending that civilization is due to the principle of teaching the natural, inevitable order of things, must be counterfeited to give the fraud a coloring of truth.

As a class, the more elevated people use all the power they can command to be served in proportion to their desires, but this irrepressible conflict between the desire for knowledge on the part of the ignorant people, and a desire to be served on the part of the educated, is compromised by a system of political deception. The stigma of depravity is hurled at any class, too ignorant to resent it, the iniquity of the whole earth is dumped at the doors of poverty, and the inability of the ignorant to resent the insult, makes them in the eyes of many sincere people, responsible for the injustice, because they were defenceless.

The very necessity of employing an intermediate system between the officials of the government and the people, is a direct denial of what is termed, popular suffrage. It is doubtless obscure to many minds to discern the real position that a political system occupies. Its necessity is taught to every youth, and while the corruption of politics is freely admitted, it is as freely urged that it can be purified. In the spirit of reason it should first be shown that the system was necessary; and regardless of what political parties have accomplished in the past, a logical necessity for such a system cannot be shown. If the people have a right to vote, it is absurd in reason that a system, which grows corrupt by its deceitful duties, must exist to dictate for whom they shall vote.

It is not strange that people in their desire to grow, besides having a continual craving of want imbedded in every heart, should cling to whatever means were at hand. Regardless of whether the ignorant are responsible or not, for the depravity charged upon them, a sincere observer must admit that one must go among the illiterate masses of humanity, to discover the numerous virtues that human nature possesses. It misleads the cultivated people very much, because the class system of society has been so thoroughly taught. It is in the feeling of responsibility for the culture of the illiterate. It is inherited from the barbarous custom of the most powerful class enslaving the weaker. One can exclaim with logical reason, why educate the ignorant, if they are in possession of greater virtues than the cultured? This brings the matter to the very point where politics plays its most deceptive part. All teachers, in their individual capacity, are subordinate to some minor system attached to politics, as the great dependence upon which the alliance of wealth and theology is maintained. Teachers, in general, are simply deceived by the training they have received. It is therefore, clear,

that teachers do not educate in the absolute sense of the term, but in reality obstruct the inevitable law of growth. This conclusion is derived from a very reasonable supposition, that a political system would not be maintained by the very class of people who profess to assist the ignorant, by teaching them to build the wall higher and thicker, between them and their natural rights — the right to vote for whatever character of government a majority may choose.

It has always been the fears of the aristocratic element of society, that a majority of the people would be successful in controlling the government. Now, this inconsistency must be clear to any person who is willing to reason honestly. One may base their reason upon either of the following premises, and draw the same conclusions from both: First, that the ignorant are dependent upon the cultured for their education; second, that the ignorant are dependent upon learning of the deceptive practices of those who teach them, before they become educated at all. That is to say, before they grow any; before they really understand what civilization means. It has always been the principle of the slave master, or the oppressors of every character, to wear the mask of a benefactor, Hence, to pretend to be in sympathy with the great principle of education, is the best disguise the real enemies of education can adopt.


There is no age in which greed has not been greedy, and when the desire for wealth has not been thoroughly cultivated, the end to be gained being the same excuse for the methods employed. The most successful thieves are those who feel justified in taking "what belongs to them," by a method of reasoning, that the goods taken were previously stolen, and that mere exchange was no robbery. This method of reasoning has its merits and demerits also, but for the purpose of this writing we have only to con-

sider, the proof from observation, that the pride of a thief is never humble until he is exposed.

The term, theology, would hardly be applied to a science, yet in the same sense that politics is the science of government, theology is the science of imagination. Thus when we have the three terms, politics, wealth, and theology, it is well to remember that whatever they apply to is in no sense affected by a misapplication of mere terms. These terms are used for no purpose other than to effect unbiased conclusion either pro or con in the individual mind.

Wealth and theology are in mutual copartnership, they are as necessary to each other as one end of a stick is to the other end. Politics is the machine in which the dust of deceit is thrown into the eyes of both the ignorant and trained equally. Wealth carries the bag by which the accumulations of industry are deposited. Theology's share of this deposit is never in dispute any more than is incidental to two robbers, or scheming partners in mercantile transactions. The fact that either can expose the other makes them mutual friends. Reason is the only enemy to be seriously feared, hence, no vengeance is too severe to be served out to those who would dare to even question the rights of so powerful a combination.

To obtain wealth has been the incentive by which men have enslaved their kind, therefore as written measures of language become more general, the intercourse of mankind is more convenient. Now the fact is, that greed in proportion to the convenience of obtaining wealth, a more general intercourse, rather improves than diminishes this species of depravity. Still another trouble arises, for the power of wealth must monopolize every science, art, or production. The reason is simple, if there are too many people wealthy, all will be masters and none will be slaves. It would be a chill to the desire of greed



for a wealthy man to dig his potatoes, and cook his breakfast, but nevertheless this would be the case if the potency of gold was at the command of the multitude. It is not recorded who first conceived the happy thought that the vanity of slaves could be cultivated, but this was doubtless the first conception of any necessity to take the trouble in teaching slaves anything. The principle may have advanced the volume of literature, and helped to civilize the race, but it was death to the slaves.

A system of theology was allied to wealth when the inherant greed of man was discovered to be making wealth too common. This very greed was the foundation from which the conception of natural depravity sprung. The slaves could be trained, wood would burn, greed would grow more greedy, hence, it was simple enough to discover, that the susceptibility of influence was inherent—the result was, the feature of growth in man was termed depravity. It was discovered by the degredation that the cultivation of greed would develop. That is, the debauchery of the wealthy was viewed as a possible result of the innocence of ignorance, the same as an idiot after seeing a fire would throw water on to a house with the excuse, that he was wetting it down because it had the disposition to burn.

Men of wealth and learning sat in counsel, it matters not how long ago, for they do so even now. Science has discovered that men grow, and the great question that has disturbed the wisdom of ages is to determine how to put weapons into the hands of the ignorant, and teach their use without imparting the secret of their being the means of defence against the teacher. Words are analogous to weapons of defence, and while muskets were made to shoot from one end only, it was decided by the wisdom of the learned, to make words so they would shoot at both ends. This was the scheme that wisdom decided upon, it

so confused the character of words that the more a person learned of them the more ignorant he grew.

The principle of growth is doubtless due to an influence. It is immaterial what the influence is compared to the fact that men as educators have never been honest in their pretensions, for they have slaughtered more beings in defence of their love of greed than they ever assisted to grow. It should, therefore, be clear to every mind that thinks, that it is not from the influence from without but the spirit from within that makes civilization a fact. Man may attribute the phenomenon to whatever he pleases, but even when cultivated, he is too dishonest to give a consistency to his claim that it is due to him. It is the chicken that breaks the shell, and no man can put it back again, hence, there is no fear of the race retrograding.

These thoughts are important to the subject of politics, for it was a system organized for the same purpose as theology, that is to pretend to serve the people by false promises, while the real object was to prevent them from knowing their power. By the scheme also, is the pretended effort of the elevated class of society to benefit the poor and ignorant exposed. Because people may be satisfied with themselves it in no sense reveals what they might have been. History cannot be so disguised as to prevent the fact being known that all inventions and improvements which have broken the bonds of custom were derived from those who preserved in defiance of their teaching, and to protect those who are morbidly satisfied a system of politics is devised.

The organization of a system of government was more to protect the accumulating wealth of society than to advance the interests of civilization. This is clearly exposed by a careful examination of the principle upon which a system of suffrage is established. The principle

of voting is an admission of the right of a majority to rule, and the deception of politics must also be apparent, for it must pretend to admit the right, and fulfill its real purpose to protect the minority from becoming so common as to be the majority. It makes no difference what is due to the learned men for introducing a system of literature upon the earth, if their ethics must first be protected by a deceptive system of defining words, and then by a close affiliation with the system of politics, for it proves beyond a doubt that the efforts were in intent more against the oppressed than for them.

No logic of the learned can disguise this injustice, for if the right of the minority to rule is derived from the power of the brain, the resort to deceptive means would have been a burden, and besides to a logical mind an assumption that implied guilt. This could be proved by all the cunning that the history of politics is filled with. There is no honest motive for permitting people to vote when a political system absolutely protects the minority from being overcome. If the common people are not properly fitted to permit of a majority rule, no man can be sincere in fitting them, who would attempt to justify the deceit in tickling their vanity with the importance of a vote. Like words and muskets, votes were put into the hands of illiterate men by men also for a deceptive purpose. The deceit betrays the motive, for regardless of the benefit to civilization, there is no evidence of good will toward men. It merely shows the desperate strait that mankind is put to in conducting deceitful operations. There is nothing that history reveals more plainly than this fact, that whenever weapons have been put in the hands of the oppressed by the oppressor, they have been turned against him, and from the evidence of the self-taught, there is no authority untinctured with theology for enforcing any method of ethical teaching upon humanity.

CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER XII.

The term, civilized, is very ambiguous when its definition is considered—"reclaimed from a savage state." It is doubtless flattering to such persons who have so cultivated their conceit as to believe they are reclaimed. Civilization can never reach beyond the condition of a form, and when a form is considered to be superior to that preceding it, to such the term is properly applied. The man or nation that conceives a superiority of one form over another, will treat such form as the most progressive—the most civilized.

The condition of the human race is not changed by the mere application of a term, and no more fruitless dispute was ever undertaken than for a person convinced of their own civilization, to try to convince another they were uncivilized. Such in reason would betray their incivility, and disclose a hint, at least, of the disposition in man to elect himself to an elevation, by assuming the height of his understanding to be the real eminence of human progress.

People who can live in society and restrain their passion, or greed, to obtain from the weak more than is rendered, are civilized whether such live in a crude or cultivated state. To be civil is to restrain ones' self from exerting the muscular power in compelling obedience from another equally entitled to exert their power. What the term, civilization, is doubtless intended to apply to, is the

prevailing force of reason over brute force. But "brutes" even can apply the term to disguise their own uncivil intentions.

This writing is not so much to show what civilities are, as the deceptions by which acts, that would put the savage to shame, are committed in the name of civilization. The same assumption in defining words is as noticeable in the word, civilization, as other important words. The purpose seems to be for a particular object, and this close affinity of words shows that definitions were carefully studied, as much to disguise some object, as to advance the welfare of mankind. The dictionary seems to be particularly arranged to justify the very oppression that civilization is supposed to overcome. We all know that the most learned men of a few centuries ago, and many of more recent date, advocated the enslaving of human beings as a means of civilizing them. Hence the definition "to re-claim" is not so strange.

This inconsistency applied to every word that heralds the restraint of brute force, must be difficult for the learned of the present day to account for. To reclaim is almost identical with the word enslave. It simply justifies an "elect society," and reflects the mooted right of ownership in human beings. It simply brings to mind the question, whether a creature of life, belongs to himself or to those who have the power to subdue him. Society can be just as arbitrary as the individual, who, it may be claimed belongs to society for the general welfare. Again we meet the difficulty of being understood correctly, by reason of the measure of language—words—being mistaken for language itself. It is the worst form of deception to attempt even to fit human ideas to the words which are properly but the measures of ideas. For instance, the relation of society to civilization depends upon what is meant by the term society. The effort to apply the term

to the "more cultivated" as one of its definitions, and to humanity at large for its other, makes a chaos of confusion. It shows conclusively that a definition to the word, society, was an attempt to justify the exclusive power of a few to oppress the many. This can be seen to be necessary to harmonize with the definition of the word civilize—to reclaim. It is simple enough, for if society was humanity at large, there would be no sense in one faction "reclaiming from a savage state" the balance of humanity.

If the oppressors of the common right to existence—the exclusive class, the "cultivated class" are entitled to credit for "reclaiming" the savage portion of humanity, they need only to be thoroughly exposed to show the necessity of being further reclaimed themselves before civilization reaches a height of consistency. The insincerity of exclusive society, or the more learned is thoroughly exposed the moment civilized methods of dispute are applied to them—reason against power. It is a shallow pretense for the learned men to assume a feeling of kindness toward the oppressed, when they also labor to protect the oppressor. It is clear, for in theory, if humanity at large were civilized and there were none to "reclaim," there would be none for the oppressor to oppress. Civilization therefore, in its true sense is not the object, for its principle development is to expose the very class who so loudly proclaim a method, which to succeed would destroy themselves.

Civilization, however, is a fact, it is the natural order of the universe to be in constant motion, it is a continual changing of form, what is termed growth. This fact being well known to the learned, they appropriate the phenomenon to their own benefit. If the learned were sincere and really believed they were conferring the benefits of civilization upon the "savage" portion of humanity, they would not resort to savage methods. For to employ civil

methods it would expose their intent, and the fact that civilization was a growth derived from the inspiration of both animal and vegetable life.


When we examine carefully what the word, civil, implies, it conveys a sense of mutual forbearance, hence the absurdity of the application of force to compel a person to become civil by the very method which civility is supposed to correct. It is surely not civil to teach civility when the effort to do it must necessarily condemn the teacher as being uncivil, by an application of his teaching to himself. The Golden Rule, do unto others what you would that others would do unto you, should be carefully studied by a person before they teach others restraint. All persons therefore, who are consistent must see the difficulty for human beings to claim a right to reclaim others, by the aid of force which is necessary to restrain before they are reclaimed themselves.

Reason is the restraining force that makes civilization possible. The mere application of the term to a nation which is a little more active, or more progressive, is but a greater degree of the restraining influence of reason. The presumption that reason is taught simply exposes the lack of it in the teacher. There is no line in history consistent with the sense of existence, which shows a single age of civilization to have been conceded by the privileged class, or higher class, until they were compelled to by circumstances beyond their control. The study of the more elevated class have always been to discover methods of exclusiveness, and no reason can be shown for the pretended assistance which is only claimed after an event occurs.

What extreme folly, in pretending to reclaim savages by jumping upon their backs, and adding to an assumed natural burden which they were ignorant of carrying. The wickedness of the "taskmaster," who encouraged the

human bondage of the past, is a standing reproof against the claim of men who would strive to excuse the iniquity. The pretense of slave masters in assigning to themselves a credit for the improved condition of the race is absurd, and when we consider our measure of language, called the English language, was conferred upon us by men who would "civilize" their own kind by whipping them, is it strange that words were given meanings to disguise the crimes of these tyrants. Applying the word, English, to the language of man reveals this attempt to disguise the past, and the presumption also in proclaiming that God made man, but man made language. We are told by scholars that the human family have some thousands of languages with a singular similarity, when in reality we have only one, which accounts for the similarity in what is properly the measures of a common language—merely the expression by which an intercourse of the mind is possible. The "English language" is therefore, only the English measure of language, for if God made man and compelled him to live in society, He did not leave him so unfinished as he would have been, without a language.

How can the extravagant terms which are taught as language aid in civilizing the earth when they are deceptive? Even admitting them to be understood by scholars, who are thereby able to exchange ideas among themselves, the real civilizing element is wanting; for it cannot be justly denied that a restrained exchange of ideas would not add to the pretended effort of "reclaiming from a savage state." It makes very little difference what the ideas are of even a savage if he has no means to convey them, and the learned men who would pretend to reclaim him by teaching him a deceptive measure of a language would betray a lack of good will, even if the struggles of the savage finally conquered the measure.




Civilization is not superior to a savage state if it is simply an aid to the greed of man to exercise his power to determine the right. It is in the prevailing virtue of the right to restrain power that makes a higher order of society possible. Hence, reason being the restraining influence, it is clear that the more simple the measures of ideas are, the more mutual will be the understanding, making of the present deceptive words, called language both an obstacle, and a necessity. The fact of an improved condition taking place will not justify the apparent intent of the learned men who defend the dictionary. For a wicked man will reverse the appearance of wicked intentions just as soon as he fails to accomplish his object. A thief will claim to be a benefactor if he discovered the house to be on fire which he both robbed and saved.

Progress takes place as a flower enfolds its leaves. It is not dependent upon the wisdom of man, but rather by the folly of man it is obstructed. History shows plainly that the efforts of the learned have been extended to keep the people ignorant as a means of obtaining a service. It is equally a pretense to teach the means of self-reliance, for exclusiveness would be in danger. It is in the effort to claim [civilization as being due to the wisdom of the learned, that a prophetic vision may be seen of a civilization when society will embrace all humanity. That is, the very effort of the exclusive class to condemn a progressive suggestion, and so readily claim the credit after it takes place, is an admission of fear. Hence, by this admission, the learned are compelled to expose their injustice toward the very savages, who, it is pretended are reclaimed by a class of humanity jealous of each other for fear of something, which can be no less than an exposure of duplicity.

Growth is as natural as for a sponge to swell up in water, or for a stone thrown up to return again. Because

force is mysterious, and necessarily possessed with a priority to its effect, it need not deter a man from using such force as his mind or reason reveals to be right. Force and matter embrace all there is. The various terms merely subdivide the elements for the purpose of understanding. Being is existence, it must be prior to a consciousness, for a light does not create the objects it reveals, neither can darkness be discovered with a light. There is only one Being that consciousness can comprehend. Every creature that can feel its own warmth is a part of this Being, the very consciousness of one's self is all the proof necessary. The qualifications, and subdivisions of words are a discovery which could not have taken place but for the priority of language. Hence, language is to words, what a light is to darkness, or Being to consciousness.

The growth of civilization is analogous to vegetable growth. Humanity is inseparably bound in one Being, by the very conception of consciousness, which necessarily reveals its own likeness. The flower may possess the power to sense its own fragrance, for because our sense will not reveal it, it is no less reasonable than the wonderful phenomenon of the human ability to feel its own warmth, or for a light to see itself. It is, therefore, in this inseparable oneness of everything that society is possible. The flower of a plant does not "own" the roots, for a separation is more disastrous to the flower than the roots. Human society is analogous for when the "higher class" assume to own the lower class, the ones who assume such folly are the sufferers, even if appearances belie the fact. This is every one's right to determine, and also the fact that experience and appearance are entirely different affairs. Also information may be experience, but experience does not depend upon information any more than the walking of a child depends upon being taught.



A child is taught in precisely the same manner as a twig is bent. It is entirely a matter of opinion to determine in what shape to train a vine or twig, but the power to untrain or straighten a crooked tree should convey to the mind of man his inferiority over his dependence over Being. For by the power of Being, and growth which is inseparable to force, is the process of bending or training accomplished. Because a man is free to move about from place to place at command of the will, or innate desire to do so, is the reason why he can oppress and be oppressed by others. Society is not created by man any more than the influence of one tree could prevent the growth of a forest. Therefore by the influence of society composed of units having nothing in common except an inherent knowledge of being, it is not possible that the unit of man could possess a free will and know exactly how to act. That is, society and individual freedom makes a strife that the very activity of life, and force of things depend upon. No man can free himself from this force, which no one can define better than the force of Being.

The slave may enjoy his Being—his existence—while his master is in constant trouble, also the illustration may be reversed, which shows the irresponsibility of acting wrong in the absence of a knowledge of what is right. It is important to determine this principle which if taught, the free will is destroyed, also the principle of a punishment ; for in the absence of a free will a unit of Being—a man—could not be responsible, and one could as logically punish a stone for rolling down hill. Of course this contradicts written authority, but if the sense of existence—Being—is the very means by which an individual comprehends, why should he deny his Being to protect that which is a mere result—effect—or a form by reason of its ever changing ?

It is immaterial how much acquired knowledge a person may have, for if it is the result of teaching, the *form* of Being is consequently out of shape, and wholly dependent upon the authority, and therefore subservient to it. No one can control the circumstances by which he is surrounded, and for that very reason an individual cannot be responsible for acting wrong whether taught, or from the sense of experience which conveys the knowledge of its being wrong. It must be borne in mind that the force of experience is prior to the effect, also that personal experience proves that good and evil by reason of the free will can be equally taught. This brings the matter home to every mind, and shows distinctly that morality cannot be taught, for the wrong cannot be known prior to the act, or personal experience of the act, any more than a person can select their birth place. Hence, man is not wicked until he knows it, any more than a knowledge of birth is prior to it. None can escape these facts, for none can comprehend them who have followed the authority of others, and therefore ceased to develop, while those who have developed, know they have been forced by circumstances, to break the fetters of their training and exercise their liberty, which every living creature possesses. Of course this can be pronounced a dangerous philosophy, and would have consigned a man to a dungeon a hundred years ago, but a man will be happier in a dungeon, with a knowledge of having performed his duty, than he who would strive to hide himself from the knowledge of a wicked act.

No one can digest this style of logic who is sincerely attached to an authority which he is fitted to. He is a slave, and more securely fettered than the slave by a chain. He is bent to conform to a system, but Nature surrounds him with more happiness than he who is obliged to increase the volume of his wickedness, to keep up an appearance

of goodness. Wrong is no less wrong by reason of it being performed in ignorance, but the impossibility of acting right without the possibility of acting wrong is well understood by the man who dares to defy his warnings and act wrong because of the discovery of the power to do it. It is therefore at this stage of a man's freedom that responsibility really begins, and while the fettered man who is robbed of a knowledge of his right and power, he is both relieved from punishment, and the ability to develop. This seeming inconsistency is explained when the known fact, which experience only can determine, that the wicked can always use the power of will which is necessary to perform an act, to restrain it also. Hence, those only who possess a knowledge of doing wrong are able to restrain, and this makes knowledge clearly responsible for wickedness. While civilization is due to the inspiration of Being in every creature, nothing less than the unconquerable desire for liberty.

The authority of man of whatever character, either written or otherwise is derived from the selfish instinct of man for his individual liberty. The very fact that men can oppress each other is the reason why the learned can oppress the illiterate, but it has been shown that the only merit in civilization, is a knowledge of the restraining power, and the act of being civil—simply reason over power. To pretend to have a knowledge of the past, and also of the future, is constantly refuted by the experience of life. Any one that chooses can determine whether their experience is what they expected, and the occurrence of the unexpected is phenomenal of the future. If the future is unknown the past is also; and what might have been is equally unknowable. This is the teaching of Being—experience—the sense of existence. And when it is seen that written authority was devised for the purpose of keeping the more ignorant in a condition of servitude, the




duplicity of the learned in trying to monopolize the measure of language will appear.

It is by the illogical claim of the favored few, which includes the learned of a nation with the wealthy, that civilization appears to be due to their efforts. Self-interests will disprove such a claim, and history furnishes a flood of proof against the pretended good will of the class of humanity from which the teachers and slave masters have received their support. This principle of ownership is so interwoven with moral duty, that a man can easily be mistaken in his judgment, when mere observations are considered as they appear. Men are taught obedience the same as a savage is beguiled into service. The desire to be moral is appealed to by the teacher who would claim the service of a savage because his simple mind could be overcome with the display of a trinket. This in logic condemns the claim of the learned to their right to teach morality, from the fact that they cannot do it without exposing by example their own immorality.

The fetters that bind the oppressed are becoming weaker as civilization advances. From the fact that education is immediate cause of progress, the learned are no less quick to take advantage of it, than the slave masters were to appropriate their superior knowledge in obtaining the services of savages. This is proved by the assumption, that the learned have a special mission to "reclaim the savage." It is disapproved from the fact that the luxury incidental to being served was the cause of more immorality than the savages possessed before they were re-claimed.

The double definition of words and the theory that might is right, has doubtless deceived a good many into a firm belief that it was their duty to force an obedience upon the child, who was supposed to inherit a depravity, which would be pointed out as existing, by reason of its



power to control even those who were learned. This would simply prove the disposition to depravity, while if the desire for morality was absent in human nature, an obedience, or willingness to serve in a menial capacity would be impossible. Whichever way we look at this matter, self-interest is more the ruling spirit of human nature, than an honest purpose to re-claim the savage, and the real method of civilization is only a puzzle to those who have been taught an obedience to literate authority, which was arranged for the very purpose of enslaving their minds.

The method by which mankind are re-claimed, is simple just as soon as a degree of experience takes place. It is by this one principle that humanity cannot shirk from. It is by the use of their own power in proportion to their degree of possession. Ideas and weapons of defence are identical, when placed in the minds and hands of the oppressed. The example of the master is a more powerful teacher than his literate methods, and by this means the race is being re-claimed. The principle is, a man wants more just as soon as he gets a taste of what he likes, and a master cannot disguise his likeness to the slave who he would endeavor to teach a spirit of obedience. The presence of the master being necessary, to service from the slave, conveys new ideas into the slave's mind. Influence is education, while the shackles of human bondage are identical with the principle of teaching. The slave gets dissatisfied in proportion to the ideas he conceives from the example of his master.

The slave reasons as a child that is taught to be good and truthful, when the example of deception in the parent will be more quickly followed; because Nature has ordained that her laws shall have a priority to those of man. The child will teach its parent morality after it detects an indifference in the parent to



follow his own precepts. Conception and perception are both treated as education by the learned, and the innocent mind, however brilliant in perception, may, in the absence of conception be the mere tool of a corrupt system, and really encourage acts of immorality that an actual conception would reveal in its true light.

The slave may be more immoral than the master, also the slave will act the part of a master over a brother slave, which merely proves the natural disposition of human nature to oppress each other. The master is as irresponsible as the slave while he is free from the intent of injustice. But the learned man who betrays his intent of deception, and effort to overcome the law of his Being by giving double meanings to the words he uses, cannot cover his tracks. Also the learned man who is guilty of a knowledge of this duplicity is equally involved, whether he admits it or not.

Nature will not be subdued by man, and whatever portion of humanity seeks to reclaim another portion by demanding a service, which practically destroys the equal right of every unit of humanity to self-protection, it will weave the net of its own destruction. Regardless of the effort to pervert history, it reveals the duplicity of the learned in the effort to claim civilization to be due to the principle of teaching, which has been enforced by the rod, and identical with man enslaving his kind. The very knives that were necessarily put into the hands of savages to serve their masters, were used to cut their own path. For instance, the Spaniards enslaved the savages in the early period of America, but the knives to cut the sugar cane were the weapons also, which the savages used to re-claim themselves. The fact that they were subdued, by being slaughtered like sheep, for no other crime than an unwillingness to endure servitude, is no credit to the Spaniards in their pretended efforts to re-

claim them. The duplicity of the learned of the present day, in still pretending to re-claim the masses, is thoroughly exposed by the effort to excuse their own wickedness, by charging it upon the ignorant emigrants, who, it is feared, prostitute the free institutions of America. Surely if the learned are sincere and believe in the re-claiming principle, it would seem to be of little consequence from whence they came.

The excuses of the learned for the historical exposure, which always follows a period of political corruption, are more in self-justification than any disposition to correct the evil. A privileged class are always willing to be let alone, and while a higher degree of culture must necessarily belong to a minority of a nation, the same as old men are less numerous in proportion to their age, the fact of what is right and wrong is undisturbed. When learned men are driven to the wall to find excuses for acts, which are admitted in the attempt to make excuses, they invariably claim exemption from being punished as a "common felon." Cultivated pride will predominate over remorse, and even admitting the authority of the learned—the minority, to be the privileged rulers of humanity, does not in any sense warrant the social condition, which permits a cultured man to commit the same act that he will teach to be immoral, and also punish the uncultured for committing it if the minority can rule by the power of knowledge, and therefore be justified as doing right. They cannot be re-claiming or civilizing humanity and oppressing them also. For whatever may be the cause of civilization, it is surely not dependent upon duplicity and oppression.

Civilization is an improved condition of humanity, or society at large. If the well being and happy relations of society are improved by the increased means of commerce, and a freer exchange of ideas, there is surely no virtue in

re-forming, or what is termed both progress and civilization. It must be admitted by the learned, or their own reason can detect the contradiction that, civilization is detrimental to the interest of an exclusive or privileged class, which is indebted to the barbarous custom of human bondage which learned men of old claimed as a Divine right for a Being to own a Being, when there can be but one true Being, one humanity, and one right.

INDUSTRY.

CHAPTER XIII.

Man is not responsible for his birth, neither is he indebted for it. He had no choice until after the light of existence burst upon his mind. Regardless of written authority, the responsibility of an act must rest upon the privilege to act, for if a person is dependant upon his surroundings after a sense of freedom is conceived, he is free from responsibility in proportion to such dependence. An assertion will not shake the logical conclusion of a child after it has experienced an act of volition.

A child will watch its own motion until the fact must be discovered by the mind, that it has the power to help itself. This sense of freedom is learned, but never taught; it is the base of true thinking; it is also an absolute proof to every mind that discovers its power to cause an event and witness the effect also. No one can determine what freedom is, except by the act, for all acts that are taught may be the free act of the teacher, but it robs the confiding pupil of his freedom, and also places the moral responsibility upon the teacher.

The pleasures of the mind are no less births than the first conception of an individual existence. Hence the happiness derived from industry can only be known to the person who becomes industrious. The necessity for labor to sustain life is counterbalanced by the pleasure of working, and no one can deny the joy of being self-sustaining or independent. One must not criticise these ideas from literal authority, for they are not intended for instruction.

We cannot teach our feelings or be taught how others feel, it is therefore only when similar experience has occurred that literal expressions can be understood.

The sense of happiness is but an impulse, or conception of the mind, from a conscious sense of a performance of duty, or a feeling of self-respect. It is only when the conditions are the same that a comparison of ideas are possible, for words are relative to experience, and it must be borne in mind, that imagination even, is but a transposition of the picture of a fact. Therefore when we feel happy a careful study of what produced it would reveal conditions which the happiness depended upon. And in the absence of these conditions the same act would cause unhappiness. For instance: The desire for food makes labor a pleasure, that would otherwise be drudgery. Also any cultivated desire will inspire a disposition to work, but in every case the character of the work depends upon an object on which the mind is fixed.

The fact of a person complaining of being obliged to work is no proof that work is a source of unhappiness. Neither the fact of observing an object of desire in the possession of another is any evidence that it produces happiness. A certain amount of labor is absolutely necessary for sustaining life, but the individual privilege of choice or free will would be a myth if every person performed their proportion of necessary labor. It is this very freedom that makes the principle of industry so difficult to reconcile with the drudgery of work to one, while another has more than he can consume without working at all.

Experience teaches that every act has its counterpart. An obligation entails every choice. The free act makes the actor responsible, and by this same rule the person who exists upon the toil of another is ignorant of what constitutes a reward for faithful duty. Such a person can fill his mind with theories and illuminate his brain

to believe what he likes, but in the absence of an experience he has no knowledge of what others suffer or enjoy. The mind action or the thoughts, the experience, the individual sense, is the only method of enjoyment. We may observe what appears to be a happy condition in others, they may even declare for themselves they are happy and contented, yet our understanding is so dependent upon experience that we have no other means to determine what others feel.

Happy people will think that others are also. It is no less true that a feeling of discontent will betray itself in the expression of pity for those who appear less fortunate, for those who labor with a care-worn expression. But our feelings for others are but the reflections from our experience. Every person can determine this, for experience is the base of understanding, and every literal term depends upon a comparison with an act of experience. The rich and the poor are equally dependent upon habits of industry for happiness. This would be doubted by a poor man, who, having a strong desire to be rich, would magnify the apparent ease of the rich to be a condition of happiness. Experience, however, will teach the rich man that his happiness is no less dependent upon industry when rich than when he was poor. We therefore look back over the path of life and find that we received the reward of industry from the immediate act rather than the product or result of the act.

The mind is susceptible of an unlimited amount of teaching, and it is very doubtful if the spirit of envy will develop from the volition of the individual mind; whatever may be the fact, the individual can only determine it. In like manner the spirit of envy that one can so readily observe in another is really but the reflection of one's own. And while a person would insist in declaring that he never felt envious toward another, his very words belie

the fact, for if he had never experienced a feeling of envy he would be utterly unable to detect it in another. This writing appeals to the individual regardless of how much it conflicts with literal authority. It shows the difference between experience and information.

A theory may be such to one, and experience to another, it would therefore present a condition of dispute that the entire vocabulary of written language would fail to harmonize. The same condition is suffering to one person and pleasure to another, which is easily determined by a careful study of one's own experience. A slave may work with a mind of joy, and feel that his master is also happy, while the reverse being a fact, the master would doubt the appearance of joy in the slave. The station in life, therefore, has no effect upon the relation of industry to happiness, all are equally dependent upon exertion for a happy existence. Experience will teach, in spite of all theories, that an act of freedom will entail responsibilities which man in no condition of life can escape. The inequality of mankind is entirely literal, for the impossibility of understanding what suffering is without suffering, needs no literal interpretation.

Theoretically we have terms to express two conditions of suffering, mental and bodily. Now there can be no bodily suffering in the absence of the mind any more than a man can drown with his head out of water. A cause of suffering may be divided and subdivided, but there is no logical sense in speaking of both bodily and mental suffering. This statement could be affirmed and disputed until doomsday, and the difference between a literal expression and the actual sense of experience would be the exact difference between two disputants, the one holding to bodily suffering and the other to mental.

Society and individual freedom presents an irrepressible conflict, and man must examine his own feelings when

he would solve the why's and wherefore's of his existence. He can determine for himself whether he suffers more from the faults of others than from his own. He must expect to be imposed upon in proportion to the knowledge of his ability to impose upon others. The envious person is mentally trained in like manner as the slave is bodily chained. The man who is chained to literal authority is just as much a slave as the ignorant "savage" chained to servitude. The learned men have always used their power to enslave the minds as well as the bodies of all living creatures who were powerless to resist. It is not strange, therefore, that such men would pretend to be benefactors, when their duplicity can be hidden in literal authority.

No one can reason justly toward himself until he can cultivate his courage to break the chains of his training, when, like a "new birth" he will discover that his freedom depends upon his courage to defend it. Such courage always exposes the sham of literal authority. Besides, it is proof enough to a man inspired with a sense of his own manhood, when he fully realizes the real extent of the learned in pretending to instruct him. A man is no less a slave when under control of literal knowledge than when he is ignorant of any means of intercourse, for only by a keen regard to his experience will he really develop beyond the designing influence of others who have the power to oppress him.


The conflict between the individual and society is a condition absolutely necessary to human activity. A knowledge of what is right depends upon an experience of what is wrong. That is to say, a literal authority for what is right is impossible, for in the absence of the experience of a wrong act in a person the right act could not be comprehended any more than a choice between sugar and salt could be made before both were tasted. No one can fail to realize the important difference between expe-

rience and information if he will carefully study himself. Information can be imparted only by a comparison to an act of experience which must have occurred prior to the information.

A man's acts will betray his motives in proportion to the literal effort to excuse them. That is, it is absurd for a man to live in idle luxury and also declare a firm conviction that industry was the peaceful factor of civilized society. It is this difficulty that exposes the principle of treachery, and also the theory of natural depravity. For how can a man justify his own sense of reason who will pretend to assist a fellowman by compelling him to perform the labor for both, and also submit to the stigma of being depraved.

The relation of depravity to the principle of industry should be carefully considered. For in theory, if industry is the civilizing principle of society, why should the class of society who perform the necessary labor be so depraved as to command the entire attention of the idle class in instructing them how to subdue their natural misfortune? Regardless of the source from which progress takes place, a system of ethics is inconsistent when it exempts the supporters of such from the force of its own teaching. No man can hide himself from his own rules, and while it is admitted that a higher state of civilization embrace the most ethics, it is no less true that a courageous struggle for liberty always preceded such a condition. Therefore, in studying a cause and effect no sensible person could claim that the cause was the outcome of the effect.

People are trained to believe certain conditions until they would cling to a belief that the material to build the earth with was brought on the railroad. Where it came from would be a question that would entitle the man who asked to the stigma of being ignorant. If the race has improved, it in no sense settles the question of what right



and wrong is. Man is not born developed, even if his descent from a more civilized condition has improved him. The question of origin is of no consequence in comparison to the right to an existence, and the privilege to determine by one's own inspiration what the term "right" really implies.

The physical necessity of exercise is a principle which no scheme of man is able to overcome. The literate and illiterate are equally dependent upon the natural law. Man can devise means of living without performing the labor necessary to produce his own food, but he must practically exert himself to the extent which would produce the food he consumes. Strict mental labor will not overcome the necessity for muscular exertion. Also the power of oppression, which is also the power of defense, will not avail in overcoming the necessity of every creature to move their own limbs. With these well known facts, the absurd attempt of the learned men to justify their authority over the natural man by the presumption that he is depraved, must be apparent to such as would compel a servant to perform for them the necessary exercise, which no one can escape.

Men who claim greater intellectual development cannot be consistent in their seeming effort to assist others, and also protect their own love of authority. The cultivated man who is superior to a mere imitator of knowledge cannot deny the force of reason. He must admit to himself there is no reason or sense for a man to assume an authority over another man and compel him to perform a service in gratitude for being civilized, when he would also hold that such a practical slave must, like other men, work out his own freedom. If this pretended authority of men to teach a literal method of freedom to their slaves was an actual fact, and a right by reason of the power to do it, such men would not expose their anxiety by disput-

ing with each other. These quarrels betray a self-interest to predominate over the pretended kindness toward their fellowmen.

The inconsistency must be clear to the man who is willing to use his reason, that to claim for all men an equal right to work out their own destiny or salvation, and to also claim a right of the more intellectual to an authority over the less fortunate. Because a man has no knowledge of his rights should he be taught an obedience toward those who have the knowledge, but withhold it to protect their self-interests?

A principle is either right or wrong, man's freedom is admitted by the fact that he can act wrong and know it is wrong from the consequences resulting from the act. Now the great question for an honest man to decide for himself is, whether he has less inclination to do wrong after acquiring a more literal knowledge of the world than when he was more ignorant.

We have literal evidence enough to settle all questions that are literally put, but what does the experience teach? It is idle for a man to tell what he would have been, but for the particular advantages which he may feel grateful for. We have the sense of observation in connection with a direct experience from a volatile act. To the extent of a likeness from an observation, we can safely presume that the sense of experience is a phenomenon common to all men. It is therefore an absolute privilege of the individual to determine the right. In fact, the only method to determine between a literal right and the experience of a right is by the sense of existence—an actual experience. Can a person understand a literal expression from the experience of another, which should control a man's act in direct opposition to his own experience? Does literal knowledge justify the right to authority over another? If the power to act from the force of superior

knowledge is right, and the ignorant can thus be compelled to serve, why is one condition of power wrong because another condition has the power to proclaim it so? If literal authority is right, why do the most learned men persecute each other for revealing to the food-producing people that they are not obliged to support themselves any more than their teachers are? It is not the slaves that complain, but the masters who are jealous of each other. No master can impose upon others without submitting to the recoil of the act, which is far more effective upon the master than the slave.

Literal authority and the shackles of the slave are identical. The learned men of all ages have exerted their energy of mind and body to its fullest extent to devise the means to compel obedience rather than enlighten the ignorant. This energy is work, it is the element of industry, it acts upon mankind equally. A ceaseless agitation is the phenomenon of Nature. Even the thief who steals his food must be active, and from the exercise he will enjoy his existence more than the gouty miser, from whom the means may have been stolen. The difference is, the miser feels the recoil of his efforts to live at the expense of others' industry, while the thief was so active that the gathering recoil in the form of remorse was for the time resisted. The necessity of industry is forced upon all, whether master, slave or scholar. It exercises more authority over mankind than all the literal power that man has devised. It is proved by experience and observation man's literal ability may be of the greatest magnitude, but the man who cultivates his desire for luxury and love of authority will be served with remorse, whether literate or illiterate, in proportion to his effort to exist without work.

To consider the teaching of industrious habits, of what virtue is the teaching from a man whose example is



a standing rebuke to his teaching? It shows a motive in the assumed authority for a teacher to teach an industry that the necessities of life force upon every living creature. Surely no one can be taught to see, hear, feel or taste, and when the teacher betrays a love for luxury and indolent ease, it would seem that his example would be more attractive than his ethics. It seems strange, therefore, that a man would seek to disguise his intent by teaching the importance of industry for the purpose of shuffling off his own duty.

What constitutes work can be determined by experience, and if labor can be divided into mental and manual, it is none the less true that manual or muscular labor preserves a better balance of the physical system than a strict attention to mental study. If, therefore, we give to the principle of industry a general scope, we must notice it to be the necessary exercise of the entire body rather than the promoting of any particular feature of right and wrong. All need it alike, regardless of their station in life, but the fact that knowledge, either literal or that from experience, increases the desire for luxury, while it decreases the disposition to exercise the muscles, shows plainly that the right to authority over man's duties is not vested in men, who as a class are controlled more by desire than reason.

Civilization is derived from general industry. Whatever stimulates a pleasure in work promotes a greater degree of civilization. But if a class of people cultivate their desire for luxury and assume authority over the ignorant, the recoil of such authority will be more severe to the higher class of society than the lower. No learned man can claim a right to authority and the type of master without some reason for it, and what is the reason? The illiterate man or slave is powerless to make a literal defence, and to use "brute force,"—muscular energy—is enacted

by statutory law to be a crime. The learned man protects his love of authority by the law of the power to do it, and condemns the principle, by making the use of power in defence, a crime.

But for the regulating force of reason civil society would be impossible. This being a fact it must be acknowledged that right is superior to power, and the particular office of reason is not so much to establish an authority of right as to determine what was right. If power can overcome reason there is no virtue in knowledge of any character. If the cart would follow the horse without any connection, there could be no reason for any traces. Hence there can be no defence for the power of knowledge to assume an authority over reason, the element in man which can determine the right, even under a condition of servitude

It is, therefore, immaterial to what extent a man may possess knowledge, acquired either from information or experience, if he ignores the importance of being attached to the principles of reason. That is to say, every one must have a reason for their act, which calls the individual to account, to himself at least, for an assumed authority over another. Now, if the influence of industry is a common necessity to the development of man, a claim of authority from a superior knowledge is not connected with reason, even if the power to enforce such authority is at hand. Real knowledge, it must be borne in mind, is not information, but the power of man to assume a title of "master" enforces his authority by declaring that information is knowledge. This is a deliberate attempt to compel reason to submit to power. Thus the scholar who becomes efficient in repeating what is taught to him, is also made to believe he is educated. What he "knows," he was informed was knowledge, and in the absence of experience it is doubtful if any one could *inform* him that he gave no evidence of possessing any superior knowledge.

It makes a great confusion of ideas to mistake literal acquirements for knowledge, when at the very best they are but the means. Now, if these terms are purposely arranged to protect the principle of "master," of authority, the end to be gained by these means can well be questioned. It must be a known fact to all who have developed beyond the ability to repeat what they were informed, that their success was due to a will power of overcoming the obstacles surrounding them. It is only successful imitators who so loudly proclaim that their advantages were due to the "kindness" of others.

It is a fact which experience only can reveal, that man develops by the power of his will to overcome his surroundings. It is no less a fact that men in the possession of book knowledge expose their conceit and lack of experience by disputing this assertion. A man is always inclined to bristle up when he is told by another how he feels. It shows the effort of the man filled with the imitation of knowledge to know more about another than one's own experience teaches. It may be seen, therefore, how absurd it is, when the character of reason and influence of industry is considered, for a learned man to defend his power to teach, and also admit that man's development depends upon his own exertion. That is, if a man is destined to serve his teacher because he is ignorant of what the teacher knows, the teacher must deny the force of reason in teaching another man that his development depends upon his own power to throw off the yoke of oppression. Surely no one can frame a reasonable excuse for teaching a man that he is responsible for being ignorant, while the learned man is irresponsible for that which he knows to be wrong and prove by the application of his teaching upon himself. To be plainer, perhaps: If a man will do wrong with a knowledge of its being wrong, upon what ground can such a man improve an ignorant man?

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

CHAPTER XIV.

Absolute justice is the perfection of death, and we must consider such a condition in human affairs theoretically, for to experience perfection the ability to express it would vanish. The just distribution of wealth does not rest with man, for whatever his assumption may be, the laws which govern human affairs are beyond his control. The man who would treat another unjustly must bear the heavy end of the act. Such is the equity of natural law.

If wealth was distributed equally and every want was gratified, the function of the will would be destroyed. Hence the effort to escape the responsibility of earning wealth is the very reason why people waste their time in grumbling about the possessions of others. Ownership is a condition that depends upon the protective power of a government. It is visionary in comparison with natural law. The individual who would complain of unjust governments would do well to study himself, and find his remedies for the evils of the day in his will power to govern himself.

The man who covets the wealth that others appear to possess, has no cause to complain of an unjust distribution, for if the opportunity occurs he will assume the title of property that he never earned just as readily as those from whom the property was transferred. It is only in the influence of wealth over a government that grants the titles to such wealth, that all men should be equally concerned. Wealth may be stolen, inherited, or decreed, but



the fact that the individual possessor never earned it will be a greater burden to carry than to supply one's wants by self exertion.

Nature will not be outwitted by the authority that men establish by the power of their will. The man who would enjoy the fruits of the earth "must" earn it. It is Nature's decree and what seems like an unequal distribution of wealth is more in the vision prompted by covetousness than an absolute fact. That is, man's title to wealth is granted by the same principle over which his will is in command. For the fact that man can do wrong by the choice of the will, is the very reason that he can both grant a title and hold wealth that was earned by others. It may be seen, however, that the right of self-government is no less fixed and absolute, by reason of man's assumption of authority in decreeing the ownership of property. The very existence of a government is a condemnation of any confidence existing between man and man.

The relation of capital to wealth is immaterial, when man's injustice to man is considered. Capital is anything that assists in gaining wealth, it does not effect the distribution of it. It is immaterial whether a man's wealth is in his title to land or his title to capital, it is wealth which he must answer for in proportion to his natural right to hold it. Man's energy is stimulated by his wants ; it is not the reflection of capital, or active wealth, that stimulates a man's exertion. It is his nature to want, and he will work just as soon as he discovers it to be the means of gratifying his wants. Competition is but a form of want, it is not inspired by the assistance of capital any more than sunshine is induced by spreading hay to dry. Want forces activity, and the result governs the will in supplying the continued demand of want.

Henry George ingeniously avoids the fundamental principle which governs human affairs His effort to

separate the value of capital from the value of land is immaterial. Also his brilliant satire upon writers who disagree with him reflects a purpose equally as ridiculous as those he so ably ridicules. His purpose does not affect the soundness of the theory he presents. He courts the favor of the laborer by denouncing the land owners as monopolists, and then pampers to the owners of capital, by clothing the term in definitions, which makes it the god of the laborer. He thus equalizes the influence of wealth upon progress and poverty.

Capital may be all that he claims for it, but it is the unjust ownership of wealth that effects the social affairs of life. Titles are granted and protected by organized governments. That is, the exclusive ownership of wealth is conferred by the power of a government. This applies no less to patent rights than to land title, also the individual ownership of capital protected by a government title. Now, it may well be said that capital must be owned by somebody. But the point at issue is, whether the power of wealth to oppress the laborer is more potent from land monopoly than from capital? Henry George's theory amounts to this: He would have all the title to wealth vested in capital. Now the ownership of capital is just as much a factor of oppression as the ownership of land, and the owner of wealth has just as much political power, whether it is in the value of land, or the value of the factory. A factory which is owned by one hundred people who gain a support from the use of this capital adds nothing to its power of production, or its potency in relieving the poverty of its laborers. That is, what capital is entitled to as compensation for its use, goes to its idle owners, while the laborers, including the inventor, and all the clerical staff even, must work or starve.

To overlook the political power of wealth and seek to justify one form at the expense of another, is about the sum total of all writers upon political economy. The great fact stands out that laborers are compelled to work for their own support and for the support of their rulers, and this in a country where it is proclaimed that the rulers are but the "servants" of the people. Such humbug is like a hungry man eating a printed bill of fare for his dinner. It is of no consequence whether land or capital is wealth, the fact is the selfishness of mankind makes them unjust and ever ready to excuse all similar faults to their own. It is the pretended theories of man that one part of humanity is owned by the other, and necessarily the lesser part by reason of literal knowledge.

Whatever a man appears to possess without earning is very visionary, and easily made use of to verify arguments both pro and con, but all who ever get anything that promotes their happiness know they must earn it. Wealth of no character will produce the happiness that the earning of one's living will. This needs no comment other than the fact that it cannot be proved by a theory.

Now the elective principle of forming governments is simply an imitation of nature, and the science of politics is but the effort of art to overcome laws which it depends upon for its own action. The force by which a product is possible will never be subservient to that product, and when we hear such terms as the "mastery of nature" it conveys too much ambiguity for human understanding. In fact it implies an error of nature that only the authority of the learned can correct. It smacks too much of the bigotry of the past which endeavored to justify the ownership of property in man, for which purpose the entire effort of the learned was employed.

Political economy is the science of cheating the laborer out of the fruit of his toil. Henry George verifies

this by claiming capital and all wealth to be the result of labor. But the ownership to wealth he seeks to justify from the advantage of capital in producing more wealth. Now the ownership of wealth is justified by natural law or such a fault could not exist. But a just distribution is as much a struggle for intelligence to contend with, as the common struggle for existence. The effort to distribute wealth equally is what the term "political economy" is supposed to stand for.

It must first be recognized that man's powers are not equal to a perfect duplicating of natural law. This starting point is necessary before a man can get a clear idea of what political affairs really mean. The man who becomes so conceited as to believe he could manage human affairs if the people would only be obedient to his will, will be a "great man" so long as his conceit is in command of himself. It is from a just recognition of the rights of others that social progress is possible, or the reason why human force is superior to the brute. It is when obedience leaves off that the will power of man really begins, for the man who is trained to a strict obedience to the will of another, is as much a brute as the lower animal.

This law is verified by reason of the social progress so obvious to the thoughtful man. The very fact that a weak man can enjoy comparative safety in the society of a strong man is proof of the will power, from which every form of confidence is established. We must, however, be careful in our assumed authority over the action of others, for all the confusion of ideas is derived from the perverseness of the will in developing one's vanity.

Henry George has made it clear in his "Progress and Poverty" that man is unjust toward man. Also Edward Bellamy in "Looking Backward" has verified the same condition. Both these writers arrive at the same conclusion in a political sense. Neither have recognized that the

illiterate have any rights that the learned are bound to respect. They have both dodged the real issue in failing to sacrifice their own attachment to wealth. This practically recognizes the ruling power of wealth and destroys the very reforms they picture to the world. Edward Bellamy says in his book that social affairs can be conducted by "officials properly elected." Henry George says the people are too ignorant to comprehend self-government ; they must be "educated." The owners of wealth are willing to do these things in exchange for the privilege of ruling.

Both of these writers justify the authority of the body politic, in its ownership of wealth, and also its supervision over the instruction of the ignorant. Wealth says: "It's a crime to be ignorant ; serve me and I will make you as great as I am." Such a condition is the foundation that slavery always rested upon. None other than the dogma of "natural depravity." It is an insult to human nature for man to claim authority over his own source, and try to justify his love of being served, by pretending that his efforts correct the errors of his Maker, may it be Nature or a power over Nature, man has given no evidence that his works are superior.

Learned men know better than to claim a *right* to educate their fellowmen, or teach them a moral duty. We teach a horse to serve us in the acquiring of wealth ; it is immaterial whether this is right or wrong in comparison with teaching our own kind. It is plain, however, that wealth controls the body politic and for self protection, it claims authority over humanity for the same reason we teach a horse.

This is clear from the very distinction (claimed by the learned) between the human and the brute, the principle of teaching from a standpoint of assumed authority applies only to the brute. It is therefore a self-condemnation to



claim a distinction between the brute and human, if human authority is justified in deciding what to teach his own kind. That is to say, if what places man above the animal is his will power to determine his own authority, the principle of teaching is arbitrary and condemns its own precepts.

The ballot forced itself upon the body politic in like manner to the power of the will breaking away from an obedience to its training. The principle which has always justified the authority of the learned to determine the duty of the unlearned is a serious conflict with the acknowledged authority of the ballot. It is useless for the learned to jumble the meaning of terms to hide this conflict of authority. If it is right to vote, it is wrong for the lesser part of humanity to rule the larger part. Henry George and Edward Bellamy both seek to protect the body politic, or the right of the minority to rule. The minority may always rule, and the whipped boy may be forced to acknowledge that he deserves it, but the picture of reforms that writers draw cannot become a reality until the principle of suffrage is squarely acknowledged.

Edward Bellamy says : Social affairs can be managed by "officials properly elected." An honest election would establish an authority of government that would destroy the power of wealth. If it is right for the minority to rule the majority, voting is an absurdity. Also if it is right for the lesser number to teach the greater number of humanity a duty of obedience to their teachers, it justifies the opposite to what a vote means. It can be seen how all reform writers charge the evils of society to ignorance, while they carefully avoid any subject that would disturb the controlling influence of knowledge.

The nationalizing of industries which forms the pith of Edward Bellamy's ideas, can never occur from an influence of wealth over the voter. Also the same feature



appears in Henry George's ideas that capital is essential to industry and the acquirement of more wealth. Wealth, therefore is the acknowledged power, and no system of government can be formulated, theoretical or practical, which is controlled by the minority of a community for the exclusive privilege that wealth cultivates.

It would be immaterial whether a government owned and operated all its industries in the supposed interests of all, if a privileged class controlled the "officials properly elected." It would effect the same purpose that now compels the ignorant to serve idleness. It could also be seen, if the power of the ballot was honestly acknowledged the government would be forced to control all industries in accord with the voice of the majority. The people would never vote to willingly submit to the minority, or power of wealth. It would be immaterial how ignorant a people were, all are born with a knowledge of self-interest—a feature of life that is never taught.

Henry George's flirtation with capital is in the same relation to popular government. Capital he admits to be wealth, but he gets up a controversy of wealth *vs.* wealth by giving capital a special definition. He can thus condemn wealth and gain popularity while he flirts with the goddess capital. He clings to the heavy end of wealth, and ignores the property owners who possess inactive wealth.

A just recognition of the principle of suffrage, even in theory, would encourage the people to feel a greater respect for themselves. There is no one who can vote or make a sign from the power of the will, but also knows he can vote for what he pleases. But when we see men of superior knowledge contending with each other for the mastery of the ignorant voter, their motive is revealed by their effort to harmonize all differences for fear the united force of what they term ignorance will produce a state of

anarchy. Men of learning seem to ignore the difference between the power of knowledge, and the power of men in their effort to control knowledge. If the man who professes to possess knowledge declares his fear of the ignorant man obtaining authority by reason of the ballot, he cannot also claim that knowledge has an absolute claim to power. Also when men claim by their arguments an authority over ignorance, by reason of ignorant men being dangerous and wicked, they should not seek methods to disguise the wickedness of compelling the ignorant to serve the learned. Surely if men are guilty of being too ignorant to hide their unselfishness, men who know how, should be ashamed to charge ignorance with a depravity that they themselves could only escape by a knowledge of how to hide it.

The owner of wealth and the owner of capital are such by the protective power of a government, and what constitutes property is immaterial, so long as the owner is the controlling influence of the government. The method of taxation is also immaterial so long as the power to tax, and the self interests of property owners are identical. The owner of capital should not be mistaken for capital any more than the owner of land for the land, and while these owners of land and capital, or all forms of wealth increase their aggregate wealth, the taxes come out of the laborer in proportion to what he can be persuaded to perform. To assess a tax upon land or capital, is merely to determine the amount the laborer must pay, for when the aggregate wealth increases, how can the owners of wealth pay taxes?


What is due to capital in the form of interest, is the same as what is due to land in the form of rent, but the relation of the owners of capital and land is the concern of the government. Now when the owners of land, capital, and all the aggregate wealth are able to own the gov-

ernment by the political method of controlling the voter, what difference does it make whether land values are taxed or any other form of wealth, so long as it is impossible to get a tax from any one but the laborer ?

The learned men of old both owned and justified the ownership of slaves, because they had the power to do it. Therefore the same rule justifies the ownership of property to-day. If power makes it right, common sense is wrong, and if men are justified in living an idle life because they have the power to condemn the ignorant or teach them an obedience, anarchy is a better word for the present state of affairs than to parade the virtues of a "popular government." Knowledge is self-revealing, it knows that ignorance gains nothing except by its own energy, or will power. To take advantage of this knowledge it must also reveal a sense of injustice toward those who are innocent of the wrong they are persuaded to do. The mere manufacture of an excuse to hide the love of wealth, will not satisfy the one who possesses the knowledge necessary to do it.

A government that is created by the people will serve the people, but wealth and knowledge are the means of the people as a boat is the means to cross a river. Therefore when wealth creates a government it will serve wealth, or the particular class who own it. The reason for this should be obvious to such men as Henry George and Edward Bellamy. Then men at least would not claim that might was right, for the admitted necessity of a government would condemn such an assertion. It should be clear to everyone that a government implies something to govern. That is, an admission that power can be directed by human will to commit a wrong as well as a right.

The existence of governments irrespective of form are derived from the natural love in man for good order, and the desire of protection in the ownership of product



as his energy creates. The majority of humanity are necessarily ignorant of the result of their acts, for if a knowledge of right and wrong could precede the act, reproduction would necessarily cease, and mankind would be so perfect as to exclude death, or variety enough to change the stereotyped features that motionless objects would possess.


It is folly for the learned to disguise a knowledge of what constitutes a superiority of the human over the brute. It is the self revealing feature that condemns the assumed authority of a specific class, or body politic over the affairs of men, who, to make the logic consistent, must be classed with brutes, and denied the self-revealing power that their masters, teachers or political owners, claim for themselves by their very act of injustice toward their intellectual squibs. If we are dependent upon teachers for knowledge, we are all brutes, teachers as well as the taught, for we do not need to be taught a self-revealing power. A man in distress of mind would be relieved of the distress, if he was obliged to wait until the nature of pain could be taught to him.

Art is the necessary scope of man's action. He can defy the self-revealing power he possesses and cultivate his vanity until he believes his opinion of himself is what others think of him. He simply reveals his mistakes by trying to hide them. Nature rules by her absolute control of the majority. Man seeks to govern in imitation of natural law, but perfection in man's form of government would destroy the scope of life, or space for matter to move in. Hence it is man's nature to grow and reach out in the direction of perfection which he cannot reach and live. The ballot is not conferred upon man, it is as self-revealing as sensation. A simple form by which man could express his will would be self-revealing in government affairs. But while perfection cannot be reached in

methods of art, a form of balloting is possible, by which the expression of every being could be recognized upon a basis of human justice.

There is no reason why the possession of wealth or knowledge should constitute a basis of authority. This evil is of itself a reproach to the possessors of wealth, who never exerted a muscle to obtain it. Yet upon the same ground that perfection is impossible the just distribution of wealth is also, while the necessity of a government exists. But the theory is clear that no man has a right to own another, or teach him an obedience that practically deprives him of the fruit of his toil while he sees others in possession of it in idleness, and protected by a government.

No one is to blame for this condition of things beyond a knowledge of its existence. But no man can respect himself and hide within his own breast a knowledge of the injustice of a government protecting the owners of wealth under a pretence that ignorance must serve as a penalty for its wickedness. How can any one in common sense believe that the majority rules, when all the wealth and learning of the land is using its entire power to prevent it? Is the possession of wealth a guarantee against a penalty for a wickedness that is known, while the owner can condemn ignorance as a punishable offence?



SCIENCE—HAPPINESS.

CHAPTER XV.


Are the people of the earth, as a whole, any happier by reason of scientific discoveries? This, of course, is speculation and can only be determined by experience and the relative power of reason. We gain no correct idea of history except by the reflective light of our experience. That is, to whatever extent we err in comparative reasoning history is misunderstood. Two distinct methods of obtaining knowledge should be considered to make this writing clear—a personal presence—experience—and the influence of signs or words which must first be taught to represent the experience. The mind is a slave to its influence until experience, and the individual power of reason betrays the deceptive method of conveying mind expressions. The one method—experience—is the actual, the other is a dependence upon others in proportion to the confidence established by the patronizing influence of teaching. The mind is subjugated by the principle of teaching, and its justification is analogous to chattel slavery. Every individual in forming an opinion is free to choose between his conception and conviction, whether he will venture upon the exercise of his own birthright or follow others. Our happiness depends upon our choice between serving others or being our own master. The slave is happier than the master because the former is a slave in ignorance of it, while the latter knows he is a slave to custom and must therefore suffer from the knowledge of its injustice.



We simply judge from our standpoint of life, if we had lived a hundred years ago our existence would have been, as a people, more unhappy. But if we consider that people living at a previous period were as ignorant of their future and our present, as we are of our future, it is reasonable to conclude they were subject to the same law from which happiness is derived. Science has established in the past three hundred years a principle by which the planets are measured, and their relation to each other are determined, but it gives no hint of their age or any specific method to measure time other than by the repetition of their movements.

It is immaterial how many times the earth has revolved, for the discovery of its movements also disclosed that the essential benefit to humanity did not depend upon the discovery. That is, mankind in ignorance was as persistently served with sunlight, as when it was discovered that darkness was but the shadow of the earth. The disposition in man to enslave his kind is no less shown in scientific research than in the selfish desire for luxury and authority. Man is no less dependent upon his courage and choice of action, than when he was receiving benefits, plain and simple, in ignorance of the extravagant terms in which science is disguised. It is also quite noticeable that man is prompted more, by the profit to himself, in scientific study, than from any brotherly love. The paternal assumption of the learned is betrayed in their injustice toward those who toil in ignorance of the law by which life can only be honestly obtained from the sweat of the brow.

It is quite as probable that all records will, at some future time, become destroyed, as that all things will be discovered. Hence we really make no advance toward the solving of the question of a first cause. If such a supposition was admitted, it could be readily seen that we



are no more advanced toward an infinite object than our forefathers were. They occupied a position related to themselves, equally with the present as related to ourselves. Our methods and forms are apparently as equally balanced between right and wrong as theirs were. Every degree of happiness, therefore, is as dependent upon the power to bear adversity as darkness is upon a planet or some material object to cast a shadow.


If we can determine the character of a form, and measure it justly, it should demonstrate the right from the wrong form. But formation is growth, and could we demonstrate scientifically, what a right form was, growth would necessarily stop at that point. It is very weak to parade a knowledge of the cause of unhappiness and betray the inability to apply it. One who would permit himself to luxuriate upon the toil of others, could not consistently claim a knowledge of the mysteries which regulate the happiness of man, and also plead a spirit of self-denial as an excuse for not using it to relieve those who toil for him. It is clear that the man who cannot prevent the shadow of happiness from alternately surrounding him, knows nothing about the relations of man's present condition to that of the past.

We speak of generating heat, it implies a production, or an addition to the existing stock, but can science determine how heat is originated? Because it concentrates at a given point it is no evidence that it had no pre-existence. In like manner happiness and unhappiness is concentrated instead of being generated. Light is distinguished from darkness by reason of objects casting a shadow. The principle does not change when a man surrounds himself with some object to exclude the light. He does not create any darkness. This condition would possibly produce unhappiness that the light would immediately dispel. Hence the relation of darkness to light is as a shadow to an object, or as grief to joy.

We fancy we are growing by comparison with the past. It may be so, but from all the evidence of science it would seem that we worship imagery—mere form—and mistake every form of which we had previous ignorance, and call it a new form. Eternity was as distant from our forefathers as it is from us. We are not a whit more advanced towards a changeless, or formless object. Time is not measured beyond the noted exactness of the revolution of the earth. Conception, growth and development are but an advance from one point to another. So far as time is concerned the revolution of the earth is marked from the point of repetition, and all science would be in confusion but for this regularity.

If from this fact we endeavor to measure time, we merely discover periods equally as exact, but of longer duration, between the points of repetition. The principle of evolution cannot measure the periods beyond the mind development, which the principle of growth or conception embraces. That is, periods of repetition are in great variety, and the fact that so many have been discovered, by a steady growth, is the very reason why we could well believe, that from daily changes, the periods of repetition are extended to eternal space. Nothing is plainer than that periods can only be measured by their repetition, and the more protracted an advance in form may be, it merely discloses the unknown duration of the period in which the events take place.

The fact that whatever is added to must increase in size, and also if everything exists that can exist, it surely follows that a change of form is but the displacement or increase of one object in proportion to the decrease of another. If this relates only to material existence, it no less reflects upon the spiritual or mental. The spiritual is but the force by which matter is formed. In the absence of matter, sensation, or the spiritual is measureless, it is self-



evident and self-revealing, it is as force to matter, and as formless as light.

Now when the development of mind is considered, with all its various attributes, and the meager period of a few thousand years compared to eternity, the relation of mind to matter, or force to matter, is not only the mystery of life, but a necessity to make life worth striving for. The metaphysical cannot be measured mathematically because it has no lines or form, and because it possesses the faculty of self-revelation it has no need of either form or material assistance. The principle of association is what disturbs the individual happiness, and when the mind can determine by sensation, or by its own volition what is pain or pleasure, it can also reason by the same principle. It is self-evident, and the only method by which the sensations of others are revealed to us.

Happiness is as dependent upon unhappiness as darkness is upon the shadow of the earth, and while we cannot measure sensation in like manner to material form, it is no less a condition of variation by reason of pain and pleasure being self-evident. It proves that degrees of sensation are not unlike degrees of heat, which is also unmeasurable except by volatile power. Heat, force, life, and spirit, are terms analagous to sensation, and if heat in its various degrees and conditions is an element, which is neither added to or diminished, why is sensation any exception to a rule that can be mathematically demonstrated in relation to material, and individually known by the self-revealing power of sensation? History records in literal forms a supposed condition of the past. What is termed true history or false history is immaterial to the fact that all recorded events are analogous to experience. The misplacing of an event, or wrong application, does not change the fact that even imagination is as dependent upon experience as what is termed a fact. That is, imagination is

but the transposition of forms which are relative to experience.


It is therefore by our experience of sensation that we reflect the present condition of things upon the past. It is but the reflection of our own experience that we attribute to our forefathers, and to determine their degree of happiness by a comparison of forms and conditions of which they are ignorant, would appear to human reason as ridiculous. It would be like asserting that the sense of taste was refined instead of the sugar. It follows that what is termed mind growth, is but a concentrated variety of forms, which produces local activity. It stimulates sensation as heat attracts heat without any loss to the general stock.

Science is nothing more than a concentration of forms stimulated by mind growth. The volume of experience is not increased, it is simply more compact. Science does not create iron, it simply puts it in a more concentrated form, and the relation of happiness to sensation is undoubtedly governed by the same law. That is, grief and joy are in undiminished quantities regardless of their concentration or distribution. It is just as probable that matter and force increases as that the general stock of happiness increases. If force increases under the stimulus of science, one of two things must be apparent, matter also increases or we reach a condition of perfect knowledge, when the necessity for food would cease because our knowledge of infinite existence would prevent the waste of tissue and conscious life would become perpetual. This is of course a mere supposition which may bring light to some minds in regard to their present existence.

The man who has never had a similar experience to some written event, will mistake it for a theory, and will endeavor to show how ridiculous such an event was. But the man who founds his ethics upon experience will not be

downed by theories, even if his own experience appears from imperfect conveyance to be theories. No man, however, should neglect his birth-right, his right of individual judgment, and believe without a doubt in records, or in information, with which his personal experience did not accord. Belief without doubt betrays bigotry and conceit, for men's experiences are as different as their ages, and to doubt the asserted experience of another upon a theoretic authority is to admit a weakness of the mind very noticeable by men of varied experience. Hence a man with his natural faculties unimpaired can always be determined by an observer in proportion to the doubtfulness shown upon theoretic subjects. Without any expression of doubt, the capacity for experience is limited, and the intellectual development stopped, by the latent power of the mind being more securely sealed up.

The supposition that science has not improved the general happiness of mankind, may be considered as follows: If matter and force has always existed, why is it not reasonable to suppose that life has also? One is as impossible to define as the other. The human mind cannot comprehend the creation of something from nothing, or one object increasing without a corresponding decrease of another. The mere changing of form has no possible effect upon the infinite character of matter and life, or substance and force. It would include every motion, thought or expression, and the mere concentration of pain at a given point, or upon an individual being is the result of absolute law, as for instance: A man standing in the sunlight and discovering that he cast a shadow, could claim he was adding to the volume of darkness. To be more definite, perhaps, and express this scientifically, let us consider a round ball—a perfect sphere—every point of which casts a shadow. It can readily be seen that the elevation of one point, by taking from another, would not add to the volume of shadow the ball would cast.



This speculation could be continued to a tedious length, besides it has no effect upon a fact whether it is proved or not. But the association of beings of an individual volition gives to shadows an individuality also. Therefore what appears to be an increase of unhappiness is but the shadow of one's self; or the necessary pain which is but the shadow of pleasure. The fact that sensation is measureless will show the imperfect comparison between darkness and pain, but nevertheless the positive and negative principle of all elements are as inseparable as space and matter to establish force.

The individual responsibility to society calls for laws which are necessarily but forms, as liable to change as shadows, when their objects move, and if the human race could be taught to believe that the proportion of unhappiness to happiness was equally distributed, the theoretic character of such teaching would also remain fixed from the relation of experience to its shadow, and in all the developments of science, shadows disappear with the objects which cast them. Hence, theories are but the shadows of facts, which may reproduce a series of minor shadows indefinitely, but the slightest change in the object or real substance will change all the shadows. This may be termed materialism or any other ism, but it will not change the real from which all isms are but shadows, and constantly changing forms, because the real moves, and shadows obey.

Men strive to disobey the positive law—the moral law—and follow shadows—forms. They strive to make others serve them and bear the responsibilities of acts which appear like an unjust distribution of happiness. But appearances are but the shadows, and happiness is metaphysical, or wholly confined to sensation. Shadows reflect shadows, as theories reflect theories, and we have no means of determining the relation of happiness to unhappiness,

except through the medium of sensation. Happiness depends upon the individuality of sensation, and we can only compare our shadows, which go to form the social relations of life. We can apply terms to them and divide and subdivide them, but it is only our shadows that associate together. They relate to our happiness according to the individual will, which determines the growth of the mind in proportion to the courage to follow the real instead of shadows.

AN IDEAL GOVERNMENT.

CHAPTER XVI.

A system of government is as absolutely necessary to society as the governing influence of reason is to the individual. All governments are necessarily "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and the fact that systems of government and individuals alike have been proved to have been wrong in the past is the best proof for asserting that systems are wrong at present. It also proves that the power to establish them is vested in man, because they have been proved to be wrong.

It is decidedly unjust to attribute wrong acts to a supreme power, may it be God or Nature, and then assume that man, who needs governing, is designed to correct them. Man's authority is limited to man, and the necessity of a government is evidence enough that man is unjust toward man. We have for example the records of the past and our own experience to determine what forms of government have proven the best. Man finds no record, or possesses any knowledge of a settled condition. All is activity, like the ceaseless evolutions of the earth, the turning of which being ever onward toward the East, it may well be assumed that the wheel of progress is analogous, and its turning backward is as impossible as a reverse motion the earth.

Men can speculate and theorize, can build ideal governments, but it is all imagination, a faculty common to man. It is no more than a transposition of mind pictures conceived from such actual event. Real progress is merely

discovery. No man knows what he seeks, for he could not seek and know both. The unexpected is more liable to occur, and an ideal government is more to point out the defects in the present system, than to assume a prophetic power to declare a system by which the affairs of society may be perfectly adjusted.

We have Edward Bellamy's idea, which has been well criticised. It exposes the effort to improve human nature by making machines of men from the intellectual power of men. It is simply an attempt to justify the authority of a privileged class of society, while it is also an appeal for the oppressed. Mr. Bellamy tries to suggest a method by which everybody may be happy. The method would deprive humanity of their individuality, and life would be a condition of servitude, which all living creatures are struggling to resist. Henry George endeavors to show that a tax upon land values would relieve the laborers from the unequal burdens they are made to bear. But an ideal government may be constructed of material taken from its effect, for the effect is also a mere supposition. It merely follows that a just government would regulate all values, instead of being regulated by them.

Both of these reformers betray the effort to shield the authority of the learned men over the unlearned. This authority protects the very principle upon which theology, politics and servitude is founded. It would be idle to talk of human rights, or the necessity of education, if the power to determine what the rights were, and what the education should be, was vested in a class of society dependent upon being the minority by its power to oppress the majority. For instance: If the old men possessed the authority to rule in proportion to their age, popular suffrage would be impossible. In like manner if the learned men possess authority to rule in proportion to their superior knowledge, a popular government would be impossi-

ble. For the oldest people, and the most learned, would, from natural law, always be the lesser number of a body forming a nation.

A political system is a part of a Republican Government. The people as a body are represented by a political body, and such body being composed of the learned men, or controlled by them, make of them the practical rulers. There are no literal questions that are literally settled, for that reason, written authority is fallible, and were mankind unwilling to accept only such principles as written authority would vouch for, progress would be impossible. Hence, if all men were satisfied that we had an absolute authority in literal terms to limit our research, the struggle for development would be ended. Every one can determine, but only for one's self, whether his mind is encircled by an authority of written language. It is infallible to the mind which so elects it, but the power to encircle the mind of another is wanting, and from this fact progress is possible.

The number of men who are learned are always much smaller than those who are taught. It is probable there are very few men of superior learning. It can only be imagined, for it would seem that a man would grow little in his own estimation, so much so that he would not dare to pronounce another learned. For it must be conceded that a man cannot decide this question upon his own judgment without reflecting a conceit that spoils his authority. No man can reach any great height while he clings to his personal conceit, and there is no maxim of greater import than the one from the Bible: "He that finds his life shall lose it." One must stand outside of himself before he can reach a degree of learning beyond that which was taught him. Such is progress.

From the relation of learned men to a system of government it is important to understand that no one is learn-

ed until he knows more than was taught to him. The volume of his teaching is practically immaterial. It is therefore clear, that the learned men may practically rule a nation, while the taught, who may claim to be learned, so corrupt a system of government, that the approach to popular suffrage is through their ranks. Hence, it would no doubt seem to such minds, who are mere victims of their training, that the earth would move backward but for their exertions. The man who feels that he is learned, and assumes to defend what he might call an ignorant attack upon learned men, will know better than to expose himself after he really learns something.

Men should consider their differences without prejudice or too strict an adhesion to the fallible authority of words. It is so easy to be mistaken when we must understand others by the reflection of our own thoughts. Therefore, by the careful consideration of the different systems of government, and a careful study of ideal systems, an improved condition of society will the sooner take place. All progress must be reached by a test of some speculative method. The inventor does not work from a material model, he must materialize the picture of his mind. A man must be born before he can fully realize how important he is, and because no record can be found if a system from which an ideal may be modeled, is the very reason it is progressive. The thinking man will test the depth of water with a stick before he rushes along, and in like manner ideal governments can be used to test the unknown depth of the future.

The march of progress is unfolding a more universal method of suffrage. The learned are more tolerant because the desire for knowledge cannot be overcome. But to disguise the whip, the dungeon, and the various methods by which the learned have tried to suppress the free intercourse of humanity is impossible. It exposes the love

of authority to be far greater in human nature, than a kind spirit towards those who are ignorant of the means of defence. To whatever cause progress is due, learned men as a class have always abused the confidence they have won from the ignorant. The average man who acquires knowledge seems to forget that no one is born cultivated, while the right to be born is ever the same. The assumed right of learned men to own the unlearned, and make them serve by teaching the obedience of servants toward their masters is a standing rebuke, that the learned as a class must account for.


Society is humanity, and the attempt to control a method of balloting in the interest of a special division of humanity destroys the very principle of a vote. There could be no "privileged class" if a government could be established that was popular in fact as well as in man. It is no excuse for the iniquity of the learned that the ignorant are "depraved," and unfit to use the ballot with discretion. No man is elevated in mind in advance of his knowledge. It is from the principle of confidence that the ignorant man is betrayed, and as this depends upon a degree of knowledge above the man who is deceived, it is surely not so much the fault of the lower being for being deceived as the higher one who knows how to do it.

Knowledge is power, but the assumed authority of the class of men, who have interpreted the element of power to embrace the right, have shown their mistake in all ages by claiming to own all creatures too weak to defend themselves. This is important to the principle of suffrage, for the men in control of a government only step down when they are compelled to by the more numerous "plebians." With the ballot in the hands of plebians they are no less in the power of learned men who can control the minds of the weak, and also control the method by which the "will of the people" may be declared. The people, however,

no sooner gain one advantage than they clamor for more, and from this source only do they get more.

What has occurred in the past is settled, but the prophetic character of man is utterly unable to settle the future. He may teach the fallacy that the learned will always possess authority over the unlearned, but if this was a logical fact they would not quarrel over the ownership of the common people, which organized parties of learned men demonstrate. Parties increase in the contest for the "spoils," and example teaches the people much faster than precept. It is difficult to get service from a man who observes his likeness living in luxury upon his toil. Man may be inferior in degrees of culture, but the effort to teach obedience necessitates the teaching of words, which also reveal the fondness of man for big salaries, until he needs assistance to carry his own conscience.

"God's ways are not man's ways," but what is just as forcible, is to say, that man's ways are always inferior to the ways of Nature. Man has not demonstrated any advantage in trying to look through Nature, and whatever difference there may be in man, or what power there may be outside the veil of Nature, the inspiration of life has revealed an equal right to determine. That the origin of cause has never been revealed to man as a medium of transmitting this cause to other men, may be as impossible to prove as the mystery itself. But that the learned men have always defended a "right" to authority, and a "right" to dictate the service to be rendered in exchange has always betrayed a motive of self-protection to be of more importance, than the pretended necessity for the future well-being of such as could be compelled to serve them. This betrays a very illogical condition, for learned men to maintain in the presence of each other. For men who are able to discern their likeness in each other are also endowed with a privilege to weigh the ideas of others



in the same scales in which they are propounded. That is, a man cannot show a consistent interest in the future welfare of a fellow-man, when he would compel him to serve, and punish him for refusing.

The absolute right, by virtue of the inheritance of life, to an equal opportunity, is a revealed knowledge to one, and with the desire for liberty it is reasonable to conclude that all beings are inspired with the same feeling. It is because the individual cannot control his surroundings that a government is necessary. If all had their rights without an effort to obtain them, it would destroy the very sense of existence in the absence of an opposite feature for comparison. Education is confounded with teaching, for the same purpose that the master of the slave tried to justify his act, in assuming it to be a benefit to the slave. Education is learning, while teaching embraces right and wrong both, and implies authority which education is not dependent upon. The principle of teaching may be modified, by specific forms, yet while a government may be controlled by a privileged class, it will protect such teaching as this class may elect.

It is loudly proclaimed for a republican form of government that it is a popular form, but if it is, it would not need to be taught, for the spirit of liberty and the desire for education is the same impulse, it is always popular, and needs no instruction, any more than a weight needs a rope to pull it down, as well as one to pull it up. The people are willing to go up, but none will ever let go the rope to pull their friends up. It makes pleasant reading to be told how much assistance a successful man needs to elevate him, but the man who waits for assistance will never experience the fact, that the up-hill road is only traveled by self-exertion.

Commerce in ideas are identical with the exchange of labor product, and the surrounding obstructions to the spir-


it of liberty is no sooner burst than new development springs forth like magic. The liberty of expression is a growth that is derived from the desire to be free. It is not due to a toleration from a higher class, for man's very nature demands that he shall defend whatever position he occupies. Hence, a government is more nearly perfect in proportion to the equity of its protection over the entire community. The test of the ballot in forming a government has developed an improved system. It suggests the possibility that a popular government is a possible development of the future. The principle of voting carries with it the admission of the right for the majority to rule. All readers are familiar with the growth of the ballot, and it matters very little how people get this privilege, for like a new birth they were never slow to utilize the advantage. This principle of voting points to the entire overthrow of aristocratic rule. It is impossible for a privileged class to exist in a popular system of government. Laborers are becoming too intelligent to look with complacency upon the result of their toil, and the very means employed to outwit ignorant voters becomes too heavy for the iniquity of the learned to protect. Voting means nothing less than the right of expression, it is incompatible with the effort to restrict suffrage to a specific qualification, for such effort only betrays the disposition of man to cling to power. It sounds well to hear men exclaim: We will give up the power to rule when the people so elect. But this merely betrays the fallacy of *giving* the people something. One might as well be *willing* to fall after the rope broke.

A popular government depends upon the same privilege to control the method of voting as to vote. A method being controlled by the minority of a community, the principle of voting is destroyed, for the minority in control of the method can by that means prevent the actual will of the people from being known. It contradicts the princi-



ple of voting to intimidate, teach, or bribe any man. For every creature has the same right to his opinion and the right of expression, as he has to his existence. Voting is useless formality if the same men who would enslave their kind are to continue to control the method of voting. An ideal system of government will merely show the possibility of the will of the people being obtained correctly. The people cannot trust the representative form—the republican form—for if men could trust each other they would be governed without the machinery of a government. Hence, the people should form the supreme body over any representative body. This could be accomplished by electing one assembly who would be the servants of the people and never the people's masters. Their duties could be to condense all questions for the final action of the people. Also all minor affairs pertaining to the executions of fixed laws. The mere detail of duties is immaterial to an understanding of this general principle, for the main feature is to recognize the supreme rights of the people as one body, and the will of the majority—to be absolute. To accomplish this feat a method of balloting must be perfect, it must be no less than honest. A method by which the method itself would be its own creator. That is to say, a method by which it could be changed or altered by the same rule that recognizes the supreme authority of the majority of the people, and the restrictions upon the universal right of suffrage could be decided in the same manner.

The honesty of the ballot is all there is to a popular form of government, for the numerous details are but the effect, and the great essential feature is the method of voting. A secret method implies a fraud, for no honest man would be ashamed to express his opinion publicly, or too timid to do so, if the spirit of intimidation was as severely denounced as it was encouraged. Secrecy, howev-



er, would be as much the privilege of the people to decide as any other matter.

A given number of people could form a community and elect one person to represent them in a state assembly. The method of balloting would be the authorized form, which can merely be supposed here to show the feasibility of a popular form of government. One must imagine himself free from all present conditions, for a clean government would be the effect and the unclean conditions now existing should be no barrier to a simple method of expressing an opinion by every individual of a community.

A method of balloting could be devised that would permit the citizen to vote by mail or go in person to a public office and deposit his ballot direct. The principle feature being its honesty, a very simple method could ensure a positive detection of fraud, which would of itself be the best safeguard against an effort to vote fraudulently. Ballots could be arranged in duplicate form, which would enable the voter to retain a stub of the ticket he voted. This would be his voucher, it bearing the same official stamp as the ballot cast. It would be simple to guard against a counterfeiting of these stubs, besides a comparison with the original would reveal the attempt. The most important feature of this method would be the publication of the vote, which would give every voter an opportunity to see for himself whether his vote was counted, besides a question of fraud could be so easily settled that no man would have anything to gain, to warrant even the attempt.

It would be simple to apply any method of balloting to the present form of government. For the Constitution even is not infallible, and when the people get possession of an improved method, which will demonstrate itself, it can never be taken away. The people, so called, have always been feared by the exclusive portion or the more

learned. This distrust is easily accounted for, and history reveals one unbroken line of the oppression of the learned, as a class, toward the unlearned. This condition has never demonstrated an infallible right to rule, for all progress in methods of government have invariably been resisted by the majority of the learned. The desire for liberty has always been the moving spirit of progress. Poets may sing, and historians write. They may vie with each other in the art of flattery, but the injustice of the learned toward the unlearned is verified by experience and cannot be polished over.

In matters of voting the ignorant and illiterate are an important factor, but all mankind are ignorant and the literate are self-elected in matters of authority. The degree of ignorance must always be greater in the majority than the minority, for the simple reason that people are born without clothes or acquirements. But why does this justify the authority of those who are cultivated to rule the uncultivated? Besides, the learned have always used the same power to enslave and oppress, as they have to teach. It shows a simple inconsistency when the selfishness of the learned is even more apparent than in the unlearned. The ability of the learned to adopt literal methods puts within their hands the means to justify their acts, and also pretend that education and civilization would be impossible without their efforts. Surely a man could not be sincere in trying to benefit another, whom he would also compel to serve.

The ignorant people of their own free will would always vote according to their measure of understanding. They do not know how to be dangerous until some one wins their confidence and then claims to own them. It is an idle dream to fear a condition of anarchy if ignorant people are permitted to vote. As well one might fear a barbarous savage after putting an empty gun in his hand.

1

No man can act wrong of his own volition without a knowledge, and it settles the question if another can teach him how to act and then punish him, which implies he was responsible for the result of the act.

An act without reason would not only be an irresponsible act but an unguided act also. Applied to a ballot, an ignorant man can no more vote with discretion than a savage could understand what a dictionary was. Ignorant voters would neutralize any attempt at voting upon questions they could not understand, and the attempt to explain would betray the knowledge of self-protection to the ignorant man, as well as the duplicity of his informer, if he should seek to guide the vote.

The method by which the people forming a nation could be the supreme power could be simply arranged. For instance: All acts of a single assembly could be acted upon by a yea-and-nay vote, making of the people a supreme authority for all questions they chose to act upon. This would be an honest recognition that humanity had a common interest in society. The assumed privilege to declare the mass of humanity naturally depraved and unfit for self-government is exposed to be a fraud by the fact that learned people will shield their own acts, which admits their guilt, and deliberately charge an ignorant man for an act of which he was in no sense to blame.

It could be readily claimed that the science of government embraced in the term politics, was equally in the control of the people. It needs no discussion upon this point after the principle of voting is acknowledged to be a natural right as well as the right to exist. It is from the persistent effort to win the confidence of the credulous, only to betray it, that the prevailing system of politics deals unfairly with the common people. It may well be considered that a responsibility for misgovernment could not be charged to any particular class of people by reason of the

vast variety of conditions. But every individual can determine the teachings of his own experience, and when the years roll by and reveal one's earlier teachings to have been false, and the confidence betrayed, the sense of reason demands a cause for the injustice that a government is supposed to correct. If it is a crime to be born in unconscious ignorance, what can the offence be for a man of knowledge to teach a condition of obedience for the mere profit to himself. Surely, if no one possesses the courage to expose the deceitful character of men who profess to teach a moral duty, progress is a myth, and wickedness rewarded for subduing the innocent.

The present disorder in society cannot be due to the necessity of more teaching, although it may be from a lack of education, the term for which being so confounded in its definition that people who are taught claim to be educated, and those who are educated have to bear the stigma of ignorance. To determine the right from the wrong one must depend upon their own authority for the self-interest in man will justify his teaching falsely, and he will court the favor of the rich to save his salary; and then protect his kind for fear his social standing will be wrecked.

Pictures as a rule flatter the object they portray. That is, the picture of a horse presents a stronger appearance of activity than the real. It is the same with the learned man and the one who portrays or imitates his knowledge. The one is learned, the other merely assumes to be. One would not mistake a picture of a horse for a real active horse and expect to see it move, but the learned man and his imitator is difficult to determine. That is, the man who merely repeats the knowledge of another can parade himself as a learned man, and possibly believe it. For this reason it is difficult to explain the reason why the people should not be contented, and admit the authority of the

learned as inevitable. Now it is doubtful if a man can be really learned and hold such an inconsistency as to claim any particular authority over another, who reflect his own likeness. It is therefore the claim of the duplicate scholar that superior knowledge in men entitle such men to rule. The very men who advance such a theory also condemn it by a system of persecutions which betrays a knowledge of their fears and guilt both. The man who learns by his own efforts could not claim a necessity for persecuting others to obtain that which he had to earn himself. Hence, it is only those who appear to be learned that seek authority, and from the prestige of their power of imitation the confidence of the defenceless people is betrayed.

It is a logical absurdity to pretend to be obligated for an assistance, and also hold to the principle of self-development. Man's method of cultivating a vegetable plant is by removing the obstructions to its natural growth, and the person who has really learned something by his own efforts is best known by his unwillingness to admit an obligation toward a mere pretender. Man's responsibility is not prior to his birth, and ideas are but new births, which convey their own convictions. It is equally illogical to treat the lower class of people as obligated for the privilege of voting. The principle of voting is identical with a free expression of opinion, and the mock system of education embraces the same spirit of greed that established human slavery. Hence, this apparent ownership of the lower class by the higher is verified by the pretended assistance to a better form of government. Nothing can be more absurd than to pretend to assist a class of people by teaching them an obligation toward the very class, for the ballot, which, if honestly used, would overthrow their authority so carefully guarded. It is clear if superior knowledge entitled a man or body of men to rule, an admission of suffrage as a benefit to the lower class is a

mere pretense. It is in the fear of the people possessing the ruling power that the higher class exert the power of their knowledge to overcome, hence one may look in vain for a method of ballot reform from a class which depends upon deceit for their ruling authority.

The only glimmer of light that breaks through this presumed right to rule by the knowledge of how to do it, is the principle of voting which carries conviction with it. It implies the right for a majority of those voting, to rule. It must eventually expose the pretended good will of men who also pretend to possess the right to rule by their knowledge, which if it were a fact the formality of voting would be silly. The political system exposes the intent to deprive the people of their natural rights. No man could be consistent and claim to give to another a right to express his opinion if he would submit to a political system to dictate what the right should be. Besides, if the people are wise enough to settle the dispute between two factions of a political system, it follows they are wise enough to manage the government without the barrier of politics that is supported to protect the interests of an exclusive class, against which the principle of voting possesses its only merit.

The vote is equally destroyed by the supposed necessity of a representative to express the will of the people. It is as much the privilege for an individual being to express their own mind as to use their hand or foot at will. A system of bondage and oppression could restrain such freedom, but the principle would be no less true. Hence, a representative government both admits and denies the right of the people to rule. Admits it by recognizing the ballot (the right of expression), and denies it by the presumption of one man representing the will of another. It is doubtful if any man can honestly represent another's will, besides the very necessity of a government belies such a presumption.

In justice, therefore, to a community or nation who possess the ballot by inheritance from those who were the creator of the government, instead of being created by it; the principle at least should be acknowledged. No man can be honest in pretending to assist an ignorant man and also take advantage of his ignorance. That is, the ignorant or illiterate are as justly entitled to what belongs to them as if they possessed a knowledge of it, and history shows plainly that all beings are inspired with the desire for development which bursts out whenever the surroundings can be overcome.

There is no reason why an entire nation could not express their opinion with as much wisdom as a smaller body who was selected to represent them. The matter of convenience could be settled by a few test methods, or ideal systems that are easily suggested. Men who have an honest sympathy for humanity would not obstruct the privilege of a free expression of opinion for fear it would destroy a "popular government," so called. Surely, if the government is already popular, what reason could any one give for fearing to trust the people? Can it not be seen that education which is but a mere mockery of the real, will never be overcome while the people are taught obedience and practically enslaved. The people will only develop in proportion to their liberty, a law as positive as sunlight, and admitted by the learned class, who seek to gain profit from the ignorant by surrounding them with an imitation of knowledge, with the apparent expectation that it will restrain the popular throb for liberty.

OPPRESSION.

CHAPTER XVII.

Why should a being who enters the world be held responsible for his surroundings which in no sense was a matter of choice to him? What can be said of a system of culture and what is often mistaken for refinement, that justifies an elevation of man built upon the ignorance of beings in their own likeness? The spirit of oppression is a part of man's very nature. No period of recorded time has been void of man's inhumanity to man. The principle that "might makes right" has been acted upon by men in all ages. It is no less a fact that the principle has also overcome by its recoil the very authority from which its tenure of right was derived.

The flexible character of words possess a convenience by which a learned man can vacillate from one position and adapt himself to any new development that takes place. But when the question of right is considered the power of knowledge must withstand a recoil of its own blows in equal proportion to that which is given out. That is to say, a man who seeks to oppress another will find his excuse for the act will condemn himself when the right is considered. Man's own compound is the bitterest drug he can take. The ability of the most learned men of all ages have been taxed with this simple problem: How can a man be free and justify his claim to a right of authority over another? History records that every attempt of man to justify an authority over the defenceless has been overthrown by the very means devised to protect it; and to look this matter square in the face one must imagine himself the being he would assume authority over.

With the present condition of words, with their double definitions, it is a mere waste of time to search history and strive to find an authority for human duty, for it can be disputed in precisely the same manner in which it is asserted. History records that which is also demonstrated by experience today. Men who occupy what is termed a higher station in society, have been, and are today, oppressive toward all such as can be compelled to yield to them, or ignorant of what their rights are. Humanity is literally divided into a higher and lower class. The majority of learned men cling with loving embrace to the higher class, for various reasons; the principal one of which is the magic power of ostracism. Men know they are wrong, for they will often admit in private what they dare not utter in public.


The higher class of society are an oligarchy as absolute as the most tyrannical slave masters of old. Their methods of defence are an evidence of their fears, and no punishment is too severe, to be put upon a learned man, who dares to condemn the right of their authority. A man may deplore the condition of the poor, and use the force of his rhetoric with apparent sympathy for struggling humanity, but he must guard his words, and leave the cause of oppression resting upon the class that is oppressed. In fact, it is this deceit that is more oppressive than all the natural obstacles surrounding mankind. It is a simple contradiction to claim that man must work out his own destiny and also submit cheerfully to the authority of those who depend upon his oppression for their elevation.

An argument in details is chaff, for a man learned in the corrupt use of words. A literal statement depends upon relative words, and it can be as readily disputed as asserted. It is only by applying the same rule to humanity entire, which the higher class of society apply to the

lower, that this question is embraced. That is, it is no less true for one man than another to work out his own salvation. Development is possible in the social condition by this principle. It is immaterial how much knowledge a man may possess if he has not the courage to be honest. His good deeds will be outweighed by his example of protecting a condition of society which gratifies his personal desires. A man may obtain his food by the sweat of others, but he cannot find servants who can relieve him from the sweat of remorse, his wickedness will oppress him with. No man is more truly oppressed than he who is obliged to defend his own deceit, to keep up a respectable appearance.

No man can justly claim to have a love for his fellow-man, and assert it with authority, or use his power to compel those he claims to love, to be obedient. Moral teaching is a presumption of authority that will not stand if the teacher includes himself in the rules of duty he teaches to others. On the other hand, if he is a subject to be taught he is unfit for a teacher. An assumed authority simply justifies the claim of slave masters from whom the first principles of oppression and authority were derived.

In considering the authority of one man over another, we must determine the right regardless of the power to enforce the authority, for man's freedom is the fundamental principle of oppression. The necessity of society is both a protection to individual freedom and consequently a constant menace to it also. The duties of men toward each other must first be tested like the necessity of being born before an experience can occur. It is doubtless true that men have held slaves and whipped them into an obedience in the full assurance of its being a moral duty. Hence the principle of development is reached by the birth of ideas and a sufficient courage to press them forward. This feature of itself condemns an infallible sys



tem of ethics, besides it dates the responsibility of an act from the conception of its being wrong. It must also be observed that the mere information of what is a right or wrong act would, if accepted as the method of obtaining knowledge, prevent all development of new ideas. One can well doubt whether man of his own volition or free act can claim any credit for the inevitable growth of human affairs.

It is only when man assumes to teach his own experience for others to avoid, who are ignorant, that the inconsistency of man's boasted wisdom is revealed. There is no excuse for a person to repeat a wrong act, or seek to build a system of ethics to justify the act. Also to assume the inevitable growth of society to be due to any specific authority of man, is equally absurd. The principle of teaching can be more justly founded upon the restless desire for action than any fallible ethics. For whatever is said in favor of teaching as a moral or physical development, the spectacle of two learned men condemning the ethics of each to be wrong confounds the principle.

When a person defies the force of reason and clings to an idea that was taught, having first been taught obedience to the teacher, to him the term bigot aptly applies. To dispute over what is literally reasonable is a waste of time, for the same reason one will not apply to another, and it is not even pretended here to instruct any one in the mysterious action of the mind. The individual can test his own reason, or freedom and responsibility are myths. Man must apply his ethics to himself before he can claim a position as a teacher, or one possessed with the right of authority. A power of authority should not be mistaken for a right. Thus it can be seen that a specific character of a man gives no authority that excludes himself from as strict an obedience as he would demand from others. This is important when reason is employed to guard a condi-



tion of cultivated bigotry, which is no less than servitude, and a condition of oppression based upon the inhumanity of man.

The principle of governing society has sprung from a system of human slavery. It gives the appearance of a superior class of men being specially created to improve the human race. Power has been the one element considered in justifying his usurpation of authority. Now the inability of man to establish a permanent authority, or a staple government, is fully verified in history. It proves that man fails to grasp his moral duty in his eagerness to gratify his personal desires. As a moral teacher therefore the same spirit of oppression has characterized his every effort. The whip and chain have been as freely used in the past, as the systematic method of ostracism is used at the present time. The power to do it is the excuse given to the illiterate, but to keep the secret within the circle of the learned is a more difficult process. The recoil of power, exerted to promote a wicked scheme, is always its own destruction. This writing is not so much a warning of some great calamity as to bring this matter clear to the man who has a variety of experiences and leave him to decide whether it pays to be dishonest.

No one will reason backward or count their chickens before they are hatched after an experience of a personal calamity. One should therefore consider how simple it is to be deceived in matters of opinion that are based upon information. The dictionary may define the term knowledge, but regardless of the age of time, experience could never have been the outcome of information. Hence the growth of a nation like the United States is readily believed to be due to the educational system, for which the higher class of society assume to be responsible. It is from this standpoint that people are as readily led away from their inherited right as much so as the slaves of old

were shackled to perform the drudgery for their masters. Experience only can explode this fallacy, for the mind that is so chained as to prevent the action of the reasoning faculties will believe in its information which practically excludes a growth of experience. A very little experience will take more conceit out of a man than all the books ever printed can put into him. We must be honest to ourselves at least, and admit that our varied successes and failures were due to our persistent personal effort to overcome our surroundings. Is it not absurd then to acknowledge an indebtedness to our surroundings which are the oppressions that only yield from the power within? Man's pretended kindness toward his own likeness is always shown by his effort to enforce it, and whatever necessity there may be for a particular oppression or surrounding to bring out the development of man, the intent cannot be disguised, when a man dictates what is kindness to another, and the amount of obligation also. Such a condition of practical ownership, and while a victim may have a given range to roam at will, the terror of consequences is the chain which holds him fast.


The principle of teaching is derived from the attempt of slave masters to justify a rightful ownership to man, or beings in their own likeness. The confusion in the measure of languages—words with double meanings—makes it apparent that education is derived from teaching. It is the same love of authority which prompts this assertion, that would civilize slaves by first whipping them into an obedience, and then for their masters to parade themselves in luxurious debauchery. These inconsistencies are not pretended to be new ideas, but are merely to show the true relation between the higher and lower class of society. If the higher class owns the lower class, by virtue of superior knowledge, it would be ridiculous to teach the mysteries by which all could be embraced in a common brother-

hood. It is this deceit, which surrounds the development of man, that he needs to learn more than any ethics which the higher class of society prepare for their own protection.

Tyrannical task masters and specific teachers patronized by the rich are identical. They may claim to be benefactors, they may claim all the progress and growth which takes place, they may chain or persecute the man who dares to expose the pretended assistance of the higher class of society toward the lower, but a man who discovers his freedom can never again be made a willing slave.

The development of the human race is a steady growth as inevitable as the unfolding of a flower. The cause is immaterial, or to what particular class of society the credit is due, the evidence of results have always been necessary before the most learned would acknowledge any progress. This is significant of the pretentious wisdom by which man claims to possess a perfect knowledge of the past, and a revealed knowledge of the future. A man claiming to believe this will thoughtlessly betray his sense of doubt, by carrying an umbrella when the weather was fair, only to return it again. If man's mistakes were his profits he would never need to teach a spirit of obedience to satisfy his love of being served.

What is claimed to be an improved condition of society is but a reflection upon the individual mind. A sick man will portray a condition of society which he will discard as soon as he gets well, while his nearest neighbor would be unaware of any change. Hence happiness is so completely embraced in the individual mind that the general condition of society has very little influence upon the units composing it. It is, however, the source of much misery to anticipate a reversion of present conditions. This is a matter of speculation which magnifies an ideal conception, until the mind conceiving it will persist in its



being a fact. Ideas and conditions are births which reveal their own identity, and no person should permit himself to suffer from surroundings in which his mind or body was incased. The path onward is illuminated as it appears, while the lights go out in the rear. It therefore follows that the condition in which man is placed, is the place for him to cling to, and if he imagines the condition of society depends upon his action, an example of honesty in proportion to the light he possesses, will the more surely fulfill his obligation. There is no reason to believe that the natural conditions would change with the advent of new ideas or an entire revolution of the present conditions. The earth would continue to bring forth in response to the warmth of the sun, regardless of the anxiety men may feel for the welfare of society.

People try to account for what seems to be, from an observation, a more elevated position in society. But appearances are so deceptive that a keen observer only can detect the sham respectability of people from that which is real. Honest people are the most credulous as a matter of course. Besides it is doubtful if the prejudice derived from literal teaching can be overcome in the mind except by actual experience. This condition of things would be disputed from one's own standpoint. But one soon betrays a lack of experience, when they talk or write about the feelings of others. The real and the false are so blended together that the honest man will trust and defend an imitator because his external appearance reflects himself. For this reason it is difficult to determine who the real promoters of human progress are. It is also somewhat obscure to determine between the higher and lower class of society. Man's reality is no less real in obscurity than when he receives a popular recognition. It is also no less true that neither popularity, wealth, or culture will absolutely refine a man.

The principle of oppression is not confined to those only who from necessity are forced to do the drudgery. Persons are oppressed in all stations of life, and one can only conclude from an experience that all beings are subject to the recoil of their own acts. It seems to disclose the only method by which moral obligations are realized. That is to say, it exposes the error of a pretty general idea for a necessity of moral teaching. It at least makes such teaching very doubtful when one compares their experience with their literal training.

No one would hold that progress and civilization was derived from the evil or deceptive character of man, unless it was to protect the evil, and when we consider that moral teaching depends upon the literal measures of language to establish even the authority for what shall be taught, it is important to observe the historical record of man's general character. The recoil of man's acts can be seen by a careful study of Webster's Dictionary. Human bondage, or the authority of man to enslave his own likeness, is literally justified in the definition given to important words. This act was doubtless increased in force as the pressure of a more general education became inevitable.

Two important features are absolutely necessary to be maintained for the principle of teaching to rest upon. First, "natural depravity," or the "fall of man." Second, the teaching of man by man must appear equal to an actual conception. Hence, the real and its relative word is treated equally throughout the entire dictionary of, what is termed, the English language. Man's desire to be served, or the disposition to get something for nothing is at the bottom of this deceit. Men who would do this were doubtless convinced of man's susceptibility of depravity when they attempted to cover up their work, by first making Nature responsible for a condition, without which no ne-

cessity of teaching would appear. Human slavery was justified by making the sign of an object equal to the object. That is, it could be proved by the dictionary that a horse and the word horse made two horses. No earthly necessity can be made to appear for one word to possess two meanings, other than the intent of deception.


This fraud in the dictionary suggests the following query: If man is honest in his assumed kindness toward his fellow-men why is it necessary to employ dishonest means to accomplish it? Words are but the coins by which expressions are exchanged, and when one realizes how words have been diverted from their honest purpose, no oppression can be shown more stupendous. It protects the authority of the learned, by reason of being learned, and practically justifies an aristocratic class of society, upon the mere formula of expression. The most oppressive slavery that man ever devised to avoid the sweating of his own brow is dwarfed by this act. If it takes a thousand years to convince mankind of this deceit, the recoil of such wickedness cannot be prevented.

It is not strange that men who would enslave their kind would endeavor to establish a system of communication to justify the act, but one would hardly suppose that learned men of the present day were ignorant of this duplicity, for nothing but a plea of ignorance could relieve a person of their personal responsibility in a matter that so vitally concerns human society. This writing can be literally disputed by the same authority that must be necessarily used to question the authority. But no authority can destroy an experience, or the fact of its occurrence, it is a condition of priority to any other form of knowledge, it is the fundamental principle even by which literal terms are comprehended. That is, words are always related either directly or indirectly to an act of conception or experience. The three words, knowledge, experience and

information seem to be the prime factors which all other words are made to conform to. It also takes these words to confuse the sense of existence literally—conception—instinct—perception—intuitions—cognition—sense—experience—information—knowledge, etc. The word experience conveys the real meaning of all of them, and to make information possess the same literal importance as experience, the word knowledge embraces them both. That is, either an expression or information would be knowledge. The convenience can be seen in observing how completely this justifies the authority of the oppression of teaching.

Whatever is taught becomes knowledge in a literal sense. It enables any presumptive man to use the word knowledge without qualification. Now knowledge cannot be experience and information both, for one may be informed of an event which never occurred, while an experience must be a fact. It may be seen, therefore, that knowledge is made to embrace a lie and the truth both. This is a mere trifle compared with the entire dictionary, but it is enough to prove deception, and it will be found that a uniform system runs through the entire book to bias the mind of every person who must first possess a form of expression before an exchange of ideas or mind pictures derived from actual experience can occur. It is a deliberate attempt to keep the entire human family divided for all time, while the principle of teaching as taught is pretended to be for the purpose of a more harmonious relation.

The importance of this may be seen, when the extravagant forms of expression are used to convey a sense of refined manners, which could be changed with every generation. And when the dictionary will protect a form as equivalent to a fact, the elevation of laborers from a condition of serfdom would be impossible. The learned men



can control all historical records by this means, and permit no defence by reason of the form it is presented in. This is but another form of slavery. It is made use of in a very practical manner, which gives evidence of this fraud being well known by those who can use it for their personal benefit.

By this method of being so wedded to particular forms of expression, all who use them are known to each other. It is like a trade mark upon merchandise. The people who have acquired a particular form can fraternize together; when one man calls another vulgar from his inability to use the specific form of expressions the word will pass through the entire fraternity, and the word vulgar is defined as pertaining to the common people, the mass, the ordinary and rustic. This effort to keep the common people in the performance of drudgery is too well attested in every-day life to need any comments. It appears to be enough to *inform* the common people they are free, and if any one doubts it and dares to remonstrate, his form of expression would condemn him to service until he could acquire the full meaning of the word vulgar. The definitions to words have no special effect upon the pure principle of education. It is only in the exposure of the assumed kindness by which a class of people pretend to assist a lower class.

It must be evident that a sincere person could not cling to a specific form of expression, known to be for a fraudulent purpose, and pretend to teach it as a means of elevation. It is also plain if it was an honest purpose to improve the literal or moral condition of mankind, that an undisputed form of conveying ideas would be simply arranged so a mutual understanding could be easily attained. These double meanings to words makes the teaching of morality apply only to the "vulgar," for no teacher could pass for a learned person who could deny the special ex-

emption of a man who would claim a right to do evil himself and also a right to teach and punish his own likeness for doing wrong.

The term, title, and its definitions betray the same effort to make the authority of man over man equal to a moral obligation, or an attempt to give such men as are entitled to be called rulers, masters or teachers, a right to the power conferred upon them by whatever confidence they could inspire in the "vulgar" or "ordinary people." This would do very well for an age when rulers called Kings were believed to possess divine authority. But for an age which proclaims republican principles upon a democratic foundation, the word title implying a right has a ridiculous significance. *It is the attempt to adjust the old clothes of tyranny to a republican form of government that makes the present confusion in society.*

A government deriving its authority from the proclaimed right of suffrage, stands in the position of a creature to a creator, or what would be the same, a product of man's work. If the relation of words to thoughts and conceptions are carefully noted, it will be seen that a form of government bears the same relation to man when it is admitted he has a right to vote or express his will. It does not change the principle whether a body of people have been defrauded by a system of politics or not. The fact that man's right to vote is proclaimed carries with it an admission that it means something, and what can it mean if not that a majority of a people may declare the form of government as well as who should administer the laws of which said people choose to adopt?

The ignorance of man or the irresponsibility of the circumstances surrounding his birth, have no possible bearing upon what is right or wrong for the man who is more developed in knowledge. However depraved an irresponsible being may be, a literal authority to him is as darkness

to a light. It is therefore a necessity to teach a system of words before this authority can avail. Now the confusion between a form of government derived from a recognized right of man to vote, regardless of a specific literal training, and a system founded upon literal authority must be obvious. If literal ethics are conceived of God it justifies written authority, and also the claim of men of superior knowledge to rule the illiterate or ignorant as they choose. On the other hand, the principle of voting as a method of governing society is wrong if learned men are right in basing their authority upon a literal form of ethics.

This writing may fail to convince a reader of the illogical position by which a man would attempt to show the right of suffrage to rest upon a literal authority by which the same man justified his right to first teach the voter how to vote. It is the right and wrong of this matter to be considered instead of the power, for if the potency of literal authority is the same in Republican forms of governments as in former monarchies, the principle of voting is not only wrong but silly. That is, if literal authority is right, the principle of suffrage is wrong.

The dictionaries shed more light upon this endless question of man's duties than all the histories in existence. For not only does it define words, but it discloses the character of the men who compiled it. The cunning method may be seen to be a complete exposure of the pretended effort to elevate humanity. When one must choose between the right and the wrong, in a full knowledge of what is right, to choose the wrong is to defy the consequences. The force or character of words is not added to, by giving them both a positive and negative definition. Therefore, in this effort to protect the authority of men by reason of their learning, it betrays the pretence of assuming to assist their fellow-men, and teach them also that

they must recognize the power of knowledge to rule, and that all men possessing a specific form of language, were rightfully entitled to demand a service without question.

Man has ever tried to make his own works equal to a real conception. This may be commendable, but when he tries to prove he has done it by giving the word information, an equal force to the word experience, it merely proves his failure. This presumption is engrafted into a Republican form of government, and regardless of the control of schools of learning by the state, the right to vote will either expose this presumptive right to rule by the power of knowledge, or a reversion to monarchical rule must occur. Had the compilers of dictionaries believed it to have been right, it would have been needless to have given words unnecessary meanings. These learned men had no need to protect their right by acting wrong, unless they had doubts about a right standing upon its own foundation. To make this clear to the ordinary observer, a brief supposition may be of use. For instance, if no such word as knowledge was in literal use, the words, experience and information, would be no less available, and would also serve every need for the conveyance of ideas. One could say: I possess experience, just as well as to say, I possess knowledge. Also, if a person was informed of any event, it would convey a much clearer meaning to say: I was informed, than to say: I possess knowledge. But the word, knowledge, is more generally used and also authorized by the dictionary. Its deceptive character may be seen by the use of the word without qualifications. That is, to say: I possess knowledge, implies either an experience or an information, this trains the tender mind to believe that information is equal to an experience, or should be equally respected. If the learned were as desirous of being honest as they appear to be in confounding their meaning, when using the word knowledge, such would say: Experienced knowledge,

or informed knowledge. This would make the word, knowledge, useless, while its independent use gives a literal appearance that a word is a conception as well as the light of experience. The dictionary is called upon to define itself—to justify the assumption that a word possesses the same attribute as the Being. Therefore, the word, define is defined as the end. God gives an opportunity to man to grow, but man in his works declares them to be so perfect that the end is reached. It is this effort to make words justify the authority of man over man, that the ballot is destined to overthrow.

There is no more reason why man should cease to develop under a just recognition of the equal opportunities for all humanity, than under an ethical authority which engages so much attention to defend. The right of ownership in human flesh will have to be settled, before a government "of the people" can be a reality. It is presumptuous for a class of humanity to assume that "we" give the common people too much liberty. Such an assumption shows the feeling of ownership, while such liberty as man is in debt for, is but a form of slavery, and contradicts the term.

RELIGION---THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Religion is no less than the truth, if it stands for morality, no qualifications therefore can be applied to that for which the term religion or truth stands for. A word is defined as a sign, and the word, religion, would be false to the truth if it stood for two objects. It must be admitted, therefore, that when a sign or word is selected to represent an object, it cannot be consistently applied to another. Thus a man who applies the word, religion, to his moral obligation toward society, cannot apply the same term to that which is taught also, that is, ethics can only be taught by means of written words which are subjected to a variety of definitions.

Now, when we understand the purity of which the word, religion, stands for, it makes the teaching of moral duty rest upon a literal sign which is interpreted at the pleasure of the individual mind. Hence, if we have the word, truth, apply to God, we have the conception and a sign also to represent Him. It may be seen, therefore, that the expression two truths, is a mere literal expression, for purity could not be pure if it required two signs to express it, for such admission would deny its purity.

Theology is the pretended science of religion, and when we consider politics as the science of government, we have only this difference between the two terms: Both are the intermediate system between man and the government of man in a state of society; but theology is assumed to govern morally, while politics is a more physical method of government. But it can be seen that both systems are embraced to govern the relations of man toward's

each other. Theology must be taught from a literal authority derived from the individual sense of moral duty. First we have the word or sign which stands for a moral obligation—religion. Now, a system for teaching religion is termed theology, but its primitive base must rest upon the moral sense of duty, which is important in the consideration of this subject.

The first knowledge that a man can possibly have is a sense of his existence, or conception, and in nothing has man displayed more ingenuity than in the attempt to justify a right of authority over his kind. It is impossible to convey or teach the sense of conception, in strict understanding, which the individual mind can determine for itself, and the power of utterance permits of the formation of signs from different sounds. Hence a commerce in ideas becomes possible by this means.

The principle of teaching being dependent upon words, it is well to fix in the mind a clear understanding of the origin of words; for it makes no difference in what particular signs words were previously uttered, every one capable of making a sign to express a sense conception, can determine the origin of words. To make this clear beyond a doubt, one should examine this carefully, for upon this principle only can the real intent of this writing be discerned. A supposition will perhaps throw more light upon the mind which is not fixed by a method of literal teaching. Two men could be cast upon an island, one a Chinaman and the other an Englishman. Their education or teaching would be immaterial, for the confusion in trying to teach each other would result in a mutual concession. The conception of a moral obligation would establish a sign or word just as surely as the two could utter different sounds. This is a mere supposition, the possibility of which everyone could readily imagine. Hence the origin of words should be admitted by a just

reasoner. Also the only apparent use for words could be seen by this illustration. It would, from the necessity of the situation, blend the moral character of the two men. They would retain their previous convictions, and discover besides that the conception of moral obligation was religion, rather than any particular sign in which it was expressed.

Such an isolation would teach these men more real religion than a life-time of literal study surrounded with influences to tempt their passions. For these two men would have killed each other in civilized society, for no other cause than a misunderstanding of each other's moral obligations.

Morality is derived from the sense of conception, and history establishes the proof, that all forms of religion are founded upon the moral obligation of man toward man. A sense of self-preservation conveys to every being just what is due to another. Passion, avarice and revenge have so far controlled the actions of man that a confusion in literal understanding is a matter of course. If all the writers of humanity understood each other, the condition would have made the tower of Babel a success, the illustration of which served a good purpose in showing man's effort to overcome his obligations. Hence it is important that a confusion of words should occur in order that some incentive should always exist. The great question, therefore, is: Can morality be taught, and if it can be taught, upon what authority can man assume a right to decide what the teaching shall be?

Carved images, pictures, natural objects, and words, are identical, as all can be used as signs of sense conceptions. It is equally idolatrous to worship any sign or symbol, for they all spring from the conception of moral obligations in common to entire humanity. All such signs are properly the literal expression of a common desire. It

makes the word, religion, apply to the moral instinct, and whatever form or sign a community adopt to express their desires or convictions, they have no effect upon the light of eternal existence.

Literal reasoning is only possible by a system of analogy, and the system of forms which are capable of being written are but the measures of expression of a common language. But for this fact the translation of different tongues would be impossible. It should therefore be seen that the extent of humanity includes all beings possessing an interchangeable method of expression. It proves the signs to have originated from a common impulse.

The right to teach must be absolutely admitted before a system of theology can be logically maintained. All nations which undertake to teach morality, or ethics, do so by a system which the word theology applies to. It should be readily seen that conception and literal teaching are two distinct methods of receiving moral ideas. The former is experience, and the latter is information which must also be analogous to experience. Thus we have for the system of theology to rest upon the possibility or impossibility of a literal sign being equal to that from which it was derived—the inspiration of moral duty which must accompany every stage of actual sense conception.

Natural depravity or the fall of man must be real to justify a system of theology. That is, the necessity for teaching must exist theoretically before the most simple mind would submit to being taught. Now, it would seem, if we look at this matter fairly, that the teacher, to the extent of what he teaches, must assume infallible authority, and if such authority is not infallible, he is an impostor. To merely claim to be fallible and teach a literal system derived from men who were infallible, is a subterfuge and meaningless, for it is to all intent and purposes the same thing. The word itself must be equally in-

spired, and possess the same vital responsibility of a man, in order to justify a system of theology being taught irrespective of a continual succession of infallible manhood. The truth will only rest upon firm ground, and it is for the individual to determine which of the two methods of receiving knowledge is the most reliable. In both cases he is equally responsible—that is, whether he chooses to be governed by his sense of conception, or by the literal ethics derived from the sense of another. A man's responsibility for either choice is due to the one infallible law of individual inspiration. If he chooses to serve, he will admit a depravity by not trusting or possessing faith in his own inheritance. If he is guided by his own moral inspiration, he will develop in proportion to a just recognition of the only infallible law by which obligation and human duty can be determined.

That man is susceptible of wickedness is shown by the records of the past, and proved by the existing facts of the present. But is it not unjust to defy the only base of human understanding, and presume to establish a literal authority for a man's condition previous to his birth, even? Would anyone condemn wood for being more susceptible of fire than iron? If literal terms are used to condemn ignorance, the men most learned in their use could not disguise to their own minds the wickedness which is also due to superior knowledge. But there is one reason more prominent than any other why theology is more responsible for the wickedness of man. That is, it is a system by which the most learned men have been able to control the commerce of ideas for their personal advantage. Men who defend a system of theology assume to teach morality, and, regardless of personal example, is the principle founded upon equity for all humanity?

For instance: This very writing can be ridiculed from a literal standpoint, and from the same authority the

laugh can be reversed. It would seem to extinguish its logical force, but it would equally prove that a literal system which could be played with to that extent was a poor dependence for moral teaching to rest upon. No one could be free or responsible for a single act, if such a person could not either acknowledge or deny the force of this writing. But the literal signs must be acknowledged in rebuttal to the same extent in which the denial is made. A system of ethical influence surrounds the individual of which he is as irresponsible as Joseph, when he was thrown into the pit by his brothers. But surroundings have nothing to do with the freedom of man's mind; and of what value is any other freedom, or condition of freedom? The force of teaching, the desire for food, or the shackles of the slave, are equally powerless to enslave the volition of the mind. Hence the system of theology is of no value to promote mental freedom, and by its fruits only is it fairly known.

It defines literally its own fruit and denies all other systems which are derived from the same source and equally as persistent in claiming to be infallible authority for man's moral conduct. This confusion is entirely literal, which is merely an advantage of the learned in literal methods. The moral condition of society is always advanced by the very process which is the most disastrous to the prevailing system of theology. The system is so elastic that it will conform to the diction of society, and then so adjust itself as to claim to be the promoter of the inevitable growth of humanity.

If theology is essential to religion, it is in the same sense that corn husks are essential to the corn, and to follow the very teaching by which the system is defended, nothing more surely condemns it. If truth and morality is the object of the system, it could not exist upon its own precepts; for no literal effort is more fatal to its claims than the recoil of its own pretensions.

The development of the human race rests upon a principle, from which the system of theology takes an advantage. But for mental growth, and physical growth—practical education—a system of teaching—theology—would be impossible. Now, let us be honest to our conceptions rather than our convictions, and admit the priority of religion to a system of theology. A duty which is taught is but the imitation of a real sense conception. Every one can determine this in their own mind, for the literal sign is immaterial to the object it stands for. It does not change a horse by calling it a cow. Influences or surroundings can have no effect whatever upon the faculty of reason, which is easily determined by observing a child as well as from one's own conceptions. The child will persist in having a definite reason for the little petty deceptions which are quite common for parents. This goes a good ways to refute the theological claim of "natural depravity;" but a person cannot be deceived in the pre-eminence of a sense conception over a conviction derived from teaching or a surrounding influence.

Theology is as dependent upon obedience as a kite is upon a string. It is therefore of the first importance; and when a child is taught obedience to literal authority, its natural sense of morality is imposed upon, and nothing but the assumption of natural depravity could overcome a free action of the faculty of reason. This is no less human bondage by reason of its being mental rather than bodily. It should be understood that obedience does not necessarily impede the faculty of reason; it merely confines it to a specific limit. It creates a prejudiced mind, while the man with such a mind would not necessarily be a bigot. Subordinate teachers of theology can be sincere and worthy of respect; also the counteracting influence of their teaching may be of the most beneficial character, yet the obedience to literal authority makes the teaching

of man infallible, and therefore both false and true teaching is merely combating with each other.

The great defenders of theology have always shown their wisdom by striving to control literal commerce. It is matters of history that men have claimed the right to rule by virtue of their power to control literal commerce. This can be seen to be morally correct when we look through literal glasses or book authority, but it will not stand the test of individual reason, even if a literal conveyance fails to make the reason clear.

If it is right for a man to teach morality, it is wrong to teach an obedience to a system which literally depends upon deception, and practically upon immorality, or the very evil it claims to overcome. Besides, if it was right, the universal teaching of any forms of expression could not possibly detract from its beneficial effect. *But the great reason why theology is false, is because its defenders—learned men—have given double meanings to words to give the appearance of their right to rule*, when it is a self-conviction. It recoils against themselves. It cannot be shown reasonably to be for any other purpose. It denies the very virtue of teaching morality, and proves what every living creature must know from conception. That is, morality cannot be taught, for by the very teaching of theology it is an individual conception, which literal authority imitates and confesses in the dictionary. It is immaterial what the tenets of theology are; it cannot stand upon a necessity of covering its own tracks. A man can deny this fraud in the dictionary, and thus admit his ignorance of it. He can admit a knowledge of it and expose his complicity with a fraud. Which will you choose?

The conflict between right and wrong is just as necessary as space for an object to move in, and a uniform understanding would be like exchanging a dollar for a dollar. Differences, therefore, should be cheerfully admitted,

for we are all indebted to this dual principle for our growth or education. It is only in the assumed ownership of man by man that the system of theology betrays itself to be wrong, and no individual can justify an act he has conceived to be wrong, by reason of a necessary conflict with right and wrong. If he chooses, however, he can cling to the wrong, and lose the growth which is only possible by adhering to the right.

The real character of theology is to teach obedience to a literal authority. It was conceived for the sole purpose of justifying the learned in the ownership of the unlearned. A slave-master would not teach a slave obedience and liberty both. Neither would men organize a system to protect an exclusive monopoly of literal commerce, and also teach it to the very ones it was designed to defraud. Therefore, the system of theology is the very opposite of religion—that is, the very opposite of a conception of moral obligation.

No one can logically dispute the necessity of a conviction in the dogma of natural depravity before an adherence to a system of theology is consistent. The human race needs no remedy for evil until after it occurs, and a system of theology, as a prevention of evil, would equally prevent the development of the race. Now, when we consider the incentive which underlies this system, it will show a greater effort to instil a spirit of obedience, than any intent of teaching moral duty. Hence, the very desire for morality which must accompany the individual conception, makes it easy to victimize a person by teaching the dogma of natural depravity.

If the principle of chattel ownership in human beings can be shown to have developed a higher order of civilization, it must be borne in mind that it is by literal methods only by which it can be proved; and if it is possible for man to maintain a theology or system to control all literal

commerce, chattel beings are defenceless. It is therefore essential to instil a spirit of obedience to literal ethics, in like manner as the individual must obey the dictates of his conscience; that is, literal ethics are justified by being analagous to the ethics of conception. Literal terms apply equally to reality and its symbols—that is, by double definitions to words. Hence, to dispute the claim that civilization is due to a chattel ownership of human beings, is to meet the literal rebuttal, that theology and civilization are companions. However false or true this claim may be, it as freely taught as natural depravity, and a thorough obedience to the one will equally embrace the other.

If the term religion does not apply to freedom of conscience, or the right to one's conception, it is false to its object. Thus, religion to mean anything is freedom, and theology cannot embrace a principle which depends upon obedience and freedom both. The obedience of a child to its parent is as natural as conception. It requires no force previous to an acquirement of a deceptive character. Yet this natural condition which is derived from mutual love is freely used to justify an obedience of an adult being to another. It is by the system of analogy that people are readily deceived, and when their convictions predominate over their conceptions, they will be as absolutely guided as if they were chained to chattel servitude. It is practically the same thing. The principle of teaching is made by the definitions of words, to be analogous to conception. A man can therefore justify his right to teach by his own sense of conception, and to convince his pupil, he must refer to the dictionary, which defines knowledge to be information and experience both. Hence, he assumes infallible powers derived from the inspiration of life, but denies his pupil the freedom to obtain his knowledge in a like manner.

Reasoning by analogy is very convenient for the learned to justify their love of ruling and being served to luxury. But when the words are given double meanings, it also gives a double character to the term—learned—and the man who is filled with classical lore is ranked by Webster—"of the first-class." A man so filled may have strong convictions, but in the absence of experience, and a preference for that which is merely analogous to the real, he is but the imitation of a learned man. It makes no difference what the character of the lore is; it is not the conception of the man. Hence, he is but the vehicle to carry the learning of others. He is in proportion to his convictions mortgaged to a system of theology.

Thus we have the real men of learning and the imitation, by the same rule that Webster defines knowledge. This confusion may be a necessity to the general activity of society, but there is no connection between learning and ruling which is just to the common interests of humanity. The seeking of knowledge, whether classical, or by the direct influence of experience, has no just connection with the government of society. History shows plainly that the natural desire for knowledge has developed more general results in the very nations where the authority of learned men is the weakest.

The system of theology merely absorbs learned men by flattering the natural love in man to rule. It is therefore as much the friend of the infidel as the Christian. It protects the owner of property and the learned man equally, in their power to rule the laborers. There is no more irreligious system of ethics existing; for its base is the fundamental principle of aristocracy, and it would be seen in its true light if deprived of its ruling authority. The conception of morality inspired in every being is religion, the very opposite of theology and tyranny.

The precepts of the Bible applied to theology would destroy the system. It is by embracing the precepts literally that the authority of the learned is disguised. But theologians cannot exemplify the precepts of the Bible and rule the masses of humanity also. The Bible is relative to human conception like any symbol of morality. It is the literal expression of a human life. And the efforts of theologians to prove an inspiration of the word or literal expression is exposed, by the necessity of giving the same meaning to the teaching of man as that derived from a real conception ; or were a special class of men delegated with divine authority, they would not have been obliged to give false meanings to words in order to hold the office. Whatever power, may it be God or Nature, it would not be so unjust as to inspire a material form with life and a sense of its own existence, and then delegate forms in the same likeness to work the same wonder, and practically make their authority more potent by use of the whip to compel a man to deny the conception of love for his own child.


If what is termed a superior intelligence, or a higher order of knowledge, entitles a man to a position of respect and unquestioned authority, it is surely a trust misplaced, if the position depended upon his use of that knowledge in deceiving the defenceless. It is folly for a man to talk about morality and the depravity of untaught or unregenerated man, and also attempt to justify the power of knowledge to rule over the natural conception of morality which connects every living thing with the light of existence.

If the word religion is the symbol of the right, the word theology is the symbol of the wrong, for the theologian is obliged to use literal means to cover his deceit. If he is innocent, he is ignorant, and a mere victim of his convictions. It is only by a strict method of intimidation

and actual persecution that designing theologians can hold the system of theology together, for the religion of Christ and natural conception is the progressive spirit of humanity. Slaves must either be chained or taught obedience by an appeal to the fear of punishment, or the physical use of the whip. The power of man to enslave his own likeness is the very proof of his freedom. Morality, reason and government are identical terms. They appeal to the sense of obligation toward the weaker portion of humanity, But when chains and whips are used to compel the defenceless to serve and be obedient to men who disregard their own moral obligations, it is not strange that an effort would be made to charge the depravity in the world to an error of Nature. Men, therefore, clothed in the conceit which is instilled into them by a theological system of teaching, not only strive to imitate natural conception, but even dare to defy eternal power.

Man's duty in acting right can never precede the knowledge of what is right, for the most senseless reasoner could not condemn a child for being born black instead of white. But practically, and to reason by a system of analogy, the child is condemned and whipped into obedience, to break the will as it is termed. This inconsistency must be maintained to justify the dogma of natural depravity. People who are really kind at heart, and in their secret thoughts admit the force of their conceptions, will, from a sense of fear, cling to their convictions.

Such people would doubtless exclaim: "No one believes in natural depravity, and it is merely raking up dead issues." But if this imposition upon innocent children is dead, upon what authority does man's claim to teach morality rest? The learned man knows he must have some base for his teaching to rest upon, and if it is not to correct the errors of natural conception, it is a base fraud. Any scholar can see for himself the foolishness of written



authority, which depends upon a dictionary to define words to be both positive and negative.


The system of theology exists upon the same double principle as the word knowledge, as defined. Relatively, theology is the dictionary and religion is the Bible. The dictionary defines theology as the science treating of the attributes of God, his laws, etc. But a careful study should be given to the definition of theologian, which is—God—to speak—one well versed in theology—a divine. The word man is modestly left out, but can be readily supplied from the word “one.” Now, when the words conception and conviction are considered, we have experience and information. Hence, it is the individual's privilege to decide by his free will, whether conviction and information govern him more than conception and experience. The theologian, as a man, admits the error of his own theory by the same literal authority he endeavors to justify it by. He must poise his system equally between right and wrong; that is, he admits for himself he is the equal of God and denies it to his likeness; that is, *he conceives his knowledge*, but to impart it he must *convict* his fellow-men. The theologian practically makes a literal God in the image of man, and assumes for himself that he was made by God, while from his desire to rule and justify his authority to do it, he must convict others of whatever wickedness he chooses to call such. By this system a theologian in human form makes himself the equal of God, and practically assumes more authority.

By this double principle of logic it is simple to maintain the dogma of natural depravity. The fact that children are wicked and rebellious toward their parents is always the reflection to substantiate the theory of natural depravity. We only have for illustration what is, and the history of what has been. But what might have been and what will be is equally unknown. Now, when we behold

a system founded upon chattel servitude, and a deceptive method of defining literal terms, is it not just as possible it teaches wrong as well as right? Hence, if it depends upon wickedness or natural depravity, is it strange that it would seek to hide wickedness for the assumed purpose of teaching goodness?

Theologians have used the power of their superior learning to justify a division of humanity. The result is aristocracy, or an exclusive class, and when the principle of religion is embraced, it can be seen to be for the purpose of monopolizing anything which is common to all. To make morality depend upon literal authority is to protect an exclusive class of society for all time, for it practically makes the masses dependent upon their teachers; and if such authority could be maintained, it would be a system of educated slavery. The social difference in society would be maintained regardless of the degree of literal knowledge; for while a system of politics or theology (both terms apply to the same principle) protects an exclusive division of humanity, natural law would not be disturbed in its supervision over the general mass of humanity. That is, Nature protects the majority against the power of literal authority.

Religion, morality and the teachings of Christ are all contrary to the division of humanity; and when the theologian endeavors to teach the precepts of Christ and also protect the division of humanity, he betrays more regard for his personal comfort than a consistent regard for his fellow-men. The wit of man can select whatever sign he may to convey literal commerce, the relative position between art and Nature will be as impossible to overcome as to breathe conception into man's works. The learned must admit to their own sense of reason, that the right to rule by virtue of superior knowledge is very inconsistent with the pretence of teaching morality, with a view to



overcoming the natural propensity of man to be more readily guided to wickedness than goodness. Besides, if people are born depraved, and also resort to deception after they become learned, by giving words double meanings to hide their intent, the destruction of the human race would have occurred before this.

To be consistent, therefore, and admit the relative character of words (literal forms of expression), the inconsistency of a revelation in literal terms—words—is as clear as sunlight. God could not possibly need the assumed characters—words—by which man endeavored to justify slavery, to reveal Himself, when the *formless* sensibility—conscience—is the medium, which no man can dispute without denying his own existence. Man may try to improve upon the nature of things with his forms of art, but the fact will remain that mankind is naturally moral and artfully wicked, which puts the dogma of “natural depravity” where it belongs.



LIBERTY AND PROGRESS.

CHAPTER XIX.

The very essence of inspiration is liberty; it is the natural power to occupy space. Progress is only possible by the expansive character of animate matter, which is liberty. Liberty cannot be conferred by man any more than conception. It cannot be taught, for the very power to teach is derived from its spontaneous existence. The principle of liberty is like a globule of air in a kettle of sap striving to escape as heat expands it. Therefore, upon general principles, the individual responsibility for the progress of a race is confined to his sense of duty toward himself.

Education in its absolute sense is liberty, but nothing can be taught without having previously occurred. Hence, teaching is not learning, but merely exhibits the oppressive character of man just as soon as his education or growth reveals the hidden wonders of life. The difference between individual progress and social progress is the confusion between teaching and learning, or between the imitation and the real. People are taught to believe that social progress is derived from literal teaching, which is an admitted fraud, from the necessity of learned men teaching words to innocent youth with double meanings.

History is written to glorify the character of the higher or exclusive class of society. It is biased in the interest of a division of humanity. The silent and illiterate are excluded by the extravagant method of expressing ideas. All literature and all methods of teaching are founded upon the events of the past; and when we consider the deceptive character of men who control literal

commerce, can it be believed that history is anything more than a fairy tale? Of what value is it to learn of the folly of our ancestors, when the fact is ever present that progress is to plunge forward into the unknown future? Who can believe that we can read the future from the reflection of the past? Now, when the deceptive character of man is disclosed in fixing history to support different methods of teaching, can the wit of man by his art overcome the very conception of individual reason?

No one can act wrong until a conception of what is wrong occurs. It is therefore of the utmost consequence whether a conviction prior to the impulse to go forward is implanted in the mind. The force of liberty is spent when a conviction is established in the literal authority of the past. Real progress is a discovery of some practical principle of which history has no record, and the fact that learned men are, as a rule, striving to find examples in history to condemn a progressive suggestion, shows their devotion to the past to be greater than any hope for the future. History itself shows the unexpected manner in which progress occurs. The changes in methods of government have always been protested against by the learned, and have been forced upon the world by the expansive character of liberty. No particular man is indebted for a progressive form of government. The ruling spirit in man which grows with his conceit, will not permit of any change that affects his position in life. The man who is served at will with whatever he desires, has no concern about progress, but instead, will advocate a strong government and condemn every new feature for fear it will encroach upon his self-interests. The fear of anarchy is the nightmare vision of the man surrounded with wealth and a conviction of his own importance.

The necessity of a government points to an undivided humanity. The grasping disposition in man will cause

him to use the power of knowledge to compel obedience from the defenseless. It is as senseless to expect a uniform condition of society as to build another tower of Babel. It would seem that the confidence in literal authority was based upon the necessary differences in human ideas. But can there be any force to reason, if one-half of humanity is always destined to serve in humble obedience? The principle of teaching can never effect the necessity for differences in commercial intercourse; and if men in the highest condition of learning are not honest enough to establish a simple system of conveying ideas, progress will not occur from their efforts.

The learned court the favor of the rich, and all methods of teaching are warped to serve the same end. Wealth is the natural reward which stimulates industry, but the equipoise between right and wrong will not permit of the excess of one principle over another. That is, if wealth is a reward of industry, and the ruling spirit in man seeks to employ that wealth to oppress his fellow-men, at the point he abandons the obligation of industry does the excess commence. This is a simple law that none can escape. It is not taught in books or regulated by civil governments. It is the throb of liberty which impels us forward, and the very effort of the opulent man to prevent a change of affairs, is often the very method by which the doors to progress are discovered to be wide open.

Liberty is activity, and progress is an occurrence of some unrecorded event. Now, is it not obvious that the principle of ethical teaching is an assumption of authority, which, if right, progress is wrong? How could progress occur, if right doing was taught to depend upon a strict compliance to what had already occurred? The acceptance of fatalism would destroy the principle of liberty, and one faces the dilemma of whether it is right to disobey ethical teaching and act prior to the knowledge of its

being wrong. This is plain, for no individual can escape the law of common sense.

By the confusion of words, from their great variety of interpretations, it could be written that it was right to do wrong in the interest of progress ; but so long as progress depends upon the liberty of action, it depends upon acts which cannot be known to be right until after they occur. It is the knowledge of having committed a wrong that gives to the mind the sense of its being wrong. In fact, it could not be taught any more than the taste of sugar. Learned men cannot hide behind the simplicity of this principle, or even attempt to drown it in complex terms, for if progress is admitted to be desirable for the individual or a community, the individual right to act contrary to what he is previously taught to be right, must also be admitted.

The principle of theology could not embrace this tenet, without a destruction of its only prop ; for to acknowledge the individual liberty of man to act by his own conception of duty, would make the teaching of morality ridiculous. But if liberty has no deeper significance than a privilege to act in imitation of previous acts, surely there is no use for the word progress. It is not much importance whether learned people will admit this or not, but can any one devise a method of teaching a people what their liberties are, without these same people discovering the right to determine them without the teaching ?

Can a reasonable man believe in his own mind that his sense of liberty is in any degree derived from outside influences ? Is not every variety of influence a restraint upon the impulse of liberty, and of what does liberty consist, if it is not an innate force to act against these restraints ? Could one advance a step, or make any progress whatever by external influences ? These questions are important to consider before the various forms of in-

justice can be understood. A man can choose to be controlled by another, rather than take the responsibility of acting direct, but he proves his liberty to progress by refusing to do it.

Progress is but a form, and how can the moral feature of a form be determined? There is no measure by which the variety of forms can be embraced. The mere assertion that progress improves the condition of mankind is more to hide the injustice of the past than to render any assistance. Nothing justifies the necessity of moral teaching more, than the declaration that man's condition is improving; it is merely to give a consistency to the dogma of natural depravity. The form of society, or form in which man gains a livelihood, does not change the relation of right and wrong. Who can determine whether the people are happier under one form of government than another? If the responsibility for the welfare of the whole rests with a part of a community, the principle of liberty must be denied, and the ownership of the weak be justly vested in the strong.

This writing is doubtless a paradox when measured by a specific form, but to the mind which comprehends the measure in which it is written, it should be a conclusive proof that it was measured, or he would not have discovered it. No one would search for a key to a door which had no key-hole. The foolishness, therefore, in pretending to understand what this writing means, and claim it is a paradox to others by reason of the form in which it is put, must be apparent.

Oppression, restraint, influence and obstacle are synonymous words. It should be also borne in mind that the words education, birth, growth and liberty are also synonymous, as they relate to progress. A yard-stick is not convenient to use as a four-foot measure, and if a person should claim to prefer it to measure cord wood with, it

would imply the intent of fraud, even if the excuse was offered that the three-foot stick was also a measure of four feet, by using it once and a third of its length. The most simple form of conveying thought expression, is the only authority for the use of words that is consistent with the true sense of liberty and progress. Hence, words with a variety of meanings cannot be the simplest measures for conveying ideas.


If natural depravity is a fact, and the moral character of humanity depends upon the art of man, which is practically derived from birth, growth, education and liberty, complexed measures of language—expression—could be justified as the means to search ancient history. But when history itself reveals the oppression, the tyranny, and autocratic position which the ruling class have always held toward the defenceless, and also encouraged by the patronage of the learned, either from fear or choice, one can well question moral ethics derived from such examples. Hence, to hold the dogma of natural depravity, which is the key-note of literal authority, one must necessarily justify the complex character of words. But if this feature is necessary in order to read the records of the past for the moral benefit derived therefrom, there should at least be no flaw in literal authority. That is, it could not be justly held that moral teaching depends upon a flaw in the system of words. Or, to put it plainer, man could not justly claim that he was willing to protect a dishonest definition of words by living a lie, and being practically immoral himself, for the purpose of teaching illiterate and ignorant people how to be better than they were born.

If development and progress practically, education and civilization is desirable, and if the commerce of ideas is the means conveyed by literal measures—words—why is the more simple method despised and the more complex

employed? A scholar could as readily transpose history into a simple measure of language, as to translate Latin or Greek. It surely adds nothing to an expression or a sense conception by the form in which its expression may be conveyed.

If any one could fancy that the poetry of life would suffer in the absence of extravagant forms of expression, he could as well fear that sugar would lose its sweetness, if it was called crystallized saccharine. It is in this very attempt to fit the truth to the method in which it is expressed that poetry, no less than the expression of life, is more obstructed than encouraged. Manner, method, form and shape are words which express identical meaning, and the attempt to teach obedience to a specific form makes it necessary to define the words liberty and progress for the very purpose of confusing their meaning.

Influence is anything that surrounds an object, like the shell of an egg surrounding a chicken. It bears the same relation to the chicken as a form to a straight line, or words to truth. Liberty is power, and if the word was used to convey a single idea, it would be identical with the word volition. What can be more confusing than to hear the expression: "He was given his liberty," or to consider a subterfuge in words, one could retort by asking: How could a man get his liberty unless it was given him? This implies that liberty depends upon an influence, while any degree of independence would destroy all the virtue the word is related to. The word permission is more modest to convey what this word liberty is often used for. The word volition gives a more comprehensive idea of the sense of being, than liberty as generally used, but the word liberty is supposed to embrace all the privilege a person has got. It can readily be seen that this confusion of definitions is more to protect the wrong than to reveal the right. To consider volition as liberty, it relates to



progress as a straight line to a form ; it is as formless as the sense of being, and the liberty which is "given" is as senseless as the motion of a stone which is thrown from the hand.

Now, if this is carefully considered in silence, it will not disturb the man who considers it, if he is determined to protect his standing in society at all hazards ; for the man who holds his feelings within the circle of his influences so strict as to exclude a single ray of progress, will never know the reason why some men whom he looks down upon enjoy continued prosperity. The conflict of life is within, rather than without, and the surrounding influences may be at war with each other, while the effect upon the volition of the mind, all the liberty the individual has got of any real value, will not be so severe as the defiance of a keen sense of duty. That is, the surroundings are not so formidable as the obstinate conflict within. Whatever a man is surrounded with, real development or progress is never a contingent influence. The surroundings of a man invite an effort which no one can reveal to another, for the same act for one could be right, while to another it would be wrong.

Confidence is developed by the courage to progress, or go forward, and it may be stimulated by external influences, but the same relation to the sense of being exists in matters of confidence as that by which any choice is effected. To cultivate a confidence in one's surroundings, puts a complete stop upon progress, for it strengthens the obstacles to be overcome. This is a condition of life as much in the control of the individual as the power to raise the arm. No one could expect to drive who was seeking an invitation to ride. The simple difference between the confidence in one's self and the confidence in another determines the degree of individual progress. To court the confidence of another is the assumption of superiority, and

the principle upon which autocratic tyranny is founded. The individual progress is so absolutely dependent upon the courage to disobey the lines of duty as laid down by literal authority, that friendship is treacherous and ceases to exist the moment self-interest is involved. Volumes of written matter could be quoted to prove the friendship of man and every word and line as readily disproved. Therefore, confidence and friendship are the influences which courage and experience only can grapple with.

Wisdom is progress derived from experience. It is not transferable from the old to the young, for if it were possible, even the very liberty which gives to life its value would be destroyed. Hence, the effort to instill a knowledge into the mind of youth to avoid the evils of the world is as impossible as to teach a wooden figure to walk. The principle of teaching civilizes the same as a boy is taught to swim by throwing him into the water, for the timidity of man is common, and an obligation for being taught how to swim by being thrown into deep water, would make the teacher responsible in equal proportion if his subject was drowned.

Honesty is no more dependent upon teaching than liberty, for if the natural instinct to be honest depended upon literal forms, the individual is an irresponsible dependent, and volition and liberty a senseless condition. Experience stimulates growth and progress in the degree that deception is thereby revealed; also a person grows less timid and more progressive as he learns to defy the influences, which guard the gates of progress as a necessary incentive to self-exertion. Honesty, therefore, is the first principle upon which the growth of man depends; but motion must have space to move in, and the child can have no sense of pleasure in acting honest, or knowledge of it even, until a wrong act is committed.

The question could well be asked: What would be-

come of the social order of humanity if unrestrained liberty was acknowledged? It is the vain assumption of man to pretend that his action restrains the liberty of others. Such an assumption implies an ownership, for to restrain liberty and give liberty would be practically the same thing. Also the question: Why do people complain if they are in possession of a liberty beyond restraint? Because they are taught to be obedient to the will of others, and the very force of liberty would thus be as a pebble enclosed in a large boulder. All philosophical reasoning is brought to a limit from the simple question: Why? For instance: Why was space occupied with matter in motion, when matter could have been at peace if entire space had been one solid mass? *Because liberty is not the act but the power to act.* It can also be seen how ridiculous a sense of motion or power to act would be until a motion occurred. Liberty, therefore, is a conception dependent upon the space to move in. It is not motion, but is derived from the effort of material substance to expand and so fill its surrounding space as to destroy its own motion. It is intercourse, and reveals knowledge by the infinite power of consciousness. All questions are brought to a focus in the revealed sense of being. It is the wonder of wonders, and the desire for liberty is dwarfed by the consciousness of it.

The assumption of man in assuming an authority over his kind by reason of a greater degree of strength, is derived from the very liberty—volition—the expansive character of matter, and no less wonderful than the existence of matter itself. Man can restrain the expansive character of water and proclaim an authority over it by literal expressions, but the element of heat, as inexplicable as sensation, will expand the water and burst all the authority that man surrounds it with.

Hence, Progress is to liberty what space is to motion, and nothing exposes the vanity and conceit of man more than to assume an authority over an element by which his very power depends; he would destroy himself in his greed to control the power by which all things move. Differences are the essential necessity of intercourse, and pain is as essential to pleasure as space is to motion. It is what we think we are that gives happiness, and only from a knowledge of pain will we flee from the wrong and accept the right. It is therefore our consciousness that governs the power of liberty to progress toward the right, rather than the assumption of man derived from a vanity in feeling so proud of his own power and liberty, that he seeks to instruct others in a knowledge of which they are equally vain. Regardless of words or forms of expressions, the example of man will teach those of less experience much faster than his rules and precepts. This is progress, for no man can teach more than what he knows, and from the observation of a pupil, who also possesses the consciousness of his being, he will quickly discern the deceit in a man who would assume to be infallible in his knowledge of right and wrong. This must be a fact, for no one could pretend to teach to another what was right without its implying the possession of infallible judgment. But when a man assumes the authority to teach and excepts himself from the force of the teaching, his example of deceit will be more readily followed than the literal meanings he would attach to his words.

Intercourse is progress—motion—life—and when the self-revealing character of the will is considered, the necessity of temptation is essential to a progress, for the existence of matter and space will not account for motion. But progress is dependent upon motion, and motion depends upon a power which may be termed an authority over motion. Such reasoning will not satisfy the self-re-


vealing character of the will, which is the very essence of liberty, and only known by the inspiration of every living thing which is conscious of its own motion.

This feature of liberty is dwelt upon, not so much to convince a deceptive character, as to show how impossible it is to be innocent of a deceptive act. The sense conception of a power to move reveals the result, and from it the reflective power of the mind—reason—will determine the act to follow. A wrong must be sensed before the impelling force of liberty can become self-revealing. It is from the sting of pain that the feeling of pleasure is equally revealed, and to the conscious being only is it knowable that no sense of warmth could be realized if a piece of ice was as radiant of heat as a coal of fire. That is, the sense of the one would be equally powerful to reveal the other. It may be called sin, evil, wrong, devil, satan, or hell, it cannot be avoided, unless we deny the revealing force of liberty, and the necessity of intercourse or movement before a progress can be revealed. That is, a liberty to taste must first exist, and a revelation of progress is only possible by the sting of sin that separates the bitter from the sweet, the right from the wrong, by an actual sense. It would be a sterile and non-progressive condition of eternal sweetness, or absolute death, in the motionless condition of a conscious right and an unconscious wrong.

The trained scholar, or a person taught, is as much a slave as the undeveloped man who is chained to a post. Both are equally ignorant of a progress that their chains restrain them from. Because injustice is possible, justice is equally so, and progress and development can only be had from the inspiration of liberty to go forward. The literal affectation of knowledge is but the picture of reality, and when this satisfies, progress for such has reached its limits. Such persons are slaves to the ideas of others, and are ignorant of their own power. The fear

of doing wrong is derived from the desire to do right, and when this fear is developed to a degree of preponderance over the necessary courage to progress, a normal condition excludes a growth that self-exertion only can reveal. Such a person is doubtless happy, by reason of the accommodating influence of Nature, for the very character of vanity is to feel that the entire world is as conscious of one's wisdom as himself.

All that can possibly be taught in equal justice is an improved method of intercourse which can be shown by actual experience to embrace a larger number in social communion. Suffrage is liberty—a birthright—which no one is in debt for. It is not a gift regardless of the literal authority to the contrary. Words, ballots, carriages and steamships are but the means of intercourse, and as their utility is understood, social understanding is more mutual. Communities and nations grow larger, for the simple and only reason that people understand each other better. It is the result of liberty, and nations, like men, are not born developed. The ballot is but an improved form of communicating the wants and desires of humanity. Not that the wants and desires are changed, but when the methods of intercourse improve, social relations expand. Social happiness is derived from a more mutual understanding. Hence, the very reason why men in their greed to get something for nothing will strive to protect all prevailing customs and denounce every step of progress. The exclusive character of society is an obstruction to progress, but the force of liberty overcomes the power of man to protect his social position, and progress is due to an infinite force, no less than an unconquerable desire for liberty.



SUMMARY.

CHAPTER XX.

The path to an object may be exceedingly crooked and even crossed and retraced, yet after the extreme points are firmly established it is more simple to draw a straight line. The preceding chapters of this book are no exception to the fallible character of man's work, but the infallibility of the necessary force to work, must be exhibited in the effort to deny it. That men are unjust toward each other is an evidence of a force by which they could also be just. Also, if the incentive to go forward is the excuse for going wrong, it is no reason that one should repeat what his experience has revealed to be wrong. It is much easier to detect the faults in others after they are committed, than to beat the necessary path to reveal the faults. Hence, a path revealing nothing but faults, reflects more credit than no path at all, or a persistent continuation in traveling in the very tracks of others.

The one object of this writing has been to show the relation of literal authority to a government which recognizes by proclamation, at least, that man is free; but the method of expression by which a man can exercise this freedom is dictated by a dictionary which reveals the duplicity by which the power of man over man has kept the human race in bondage. No man is free who is securely tied to a method of expression which excludes him from all methods except those which were taught him. Such obedience destroys the principle of American independence. This continual effort to serve out the same literal means of intercourse to a free people, as were used to teach slaves an obedience to their masters, is a reproach to the principle of brotherly love.

The great progress in America is not due to what is taught in the public schools, so much as the fact of their being public. Man is just as ready to be served after all the culture he receives, as he was when slaves were whipped into obedience, and the expansion of society is wholly due to methods of intercourse being more mutually understood. That this is not derived from the principle of teaching is proved by the studied care by which words used by the teacher are given both a positive and negative definition.

No one can teach a moral duty to another without its implying an infallible judgment. That is, the teacher must assume that all other systems are wrong ; and when we recognize, as a government, the right of conscience to a diversity of opinions, the absurdity of a teacher assuming an infallible judgment is surely revealed to him who understands what the ballot really means.

Men familiar with the literal forms—words—by which the sense of being able to establish social relations, call it knowledge. They also pervert an illiteracy into a seeming ignorance, which is paraded at every opportunity. No writer who seeks popular notice will admit the illiterate are other than ignorant. Philosophers, Christians, Infidels, Reformers, Scientists, Politicians and Suffragists are all united upon this word, ignorance. All the faults of the world are charged to those who are defenceless by reason of not understanding the terms by which their supposed crimes are charged upon them. As if the smiling innocence of the babe was not more truly God than the man who would seek to make it more God-like by teaching it literal terms, which are given a variety of meanings for a seeming convenience to hide the wickedness that knowledge reveals.

Ignorance is a virtue that puts literal acquirements to shame. It is the merest assertion to call the acquirement

of words, or a familiarity with their definitions, knowledge, for if such is knowledge, the innate force of conception, or sensation, is practically ignored by the use of the word, ignorant, as applied to an illiterate person. What is meant by asserting that a person is ignorant would require a multitude of words to explain, for the opposite of ignorance is knowledge, and to possess knowledge and no capacity to learn, practically a senseless condition, is to be, in common parlance, a fool. Now, it must be admitted that the most ignorant person is in possession of sensation, or he is not what is termed a person. If you choose to call him a brute, because he is "low-bred," the alternative of what a well-bred person is, would be a fool. Hence, if we choose to call another ignorant or a brute, must in justice to even literal familiarity see the position we occupy. That is, to assume to possess a knowledge of another's ignorance, and to class such with brutes, is to parade a much lower position for one's self.

The fact is, all are ignorant, or the faculty of sensation has reached a limit, and to live is motion, intercourse. Therefore, the man who reaches a limit, must either recede or cease to live. Commerce, or intercourse, is social development, and understood from the term, civilization; and when we cannot explain to our own minds the self-revealing force of sensation, how much less can we explain it to another. It is therefore the desire for better understanding that promotes a social growth. The ignorant or illiterate are powerless to convey any expression of their will, either by vote or word, if the method is not a mutual one. Hence, if the intent of a system of teaching was to promote social growth, the terms employed should be consistent with such a conclusion. Now, when words are taught which are defined in the dictionary for the special protection of exclusive society, the assumption that the principle of teaching is to promote a social

growth is the merest pretence. The fact that civilization occurs is no more to the credit of a system of teaching, than that the master of slaves should be exonerated because his slaves become more civilized than they formerly were. Surely a person cannot advocate the teaching of ambiguous words for fear the common people will learn too much, and also claim they are striving to improve them.

Until the literate can show by example an improved moral character, the observer cannot fail to note that wickedness is fully as common among the literary learned as among the common people, who are often unconscious of the terms applied to them. This should show clearly the hopeless character of a system of teaching, by which even the teacher cannot disguise his own wickedness to those equally learned. Surely, if the teacher must admit his fallibility, he cannot also claim his teaching is necessary to redeem the fallen character of the ignorant.

Argument is useless to a person who is thoroughly wedded to the ideas of others. No slave was ever more firmly bound, and a person may feel a keen desire to assist another; he cannot do so when he claims a reward greater in value than the service he renders. The natural result of exchange is intercourse, motion, life, liberty; it cannot occur unless the characters of the objects exchanged are different. That is, to exchange a dollar for a dollar would reveal an unchanged position that the natural law of motion will not tolerate. For instance, an object cannot move and be confined to the same position it formerly occupied.

A repeated experience makes us familiar with natural law; we try to impart such knowledge to those we love or cherish, but however sincere the purpose may be, natural law will not accommodate our desires. We can improve others only as we improve ourselves, for the principle of

deceit is self-revealing, and so long as we seek to hide our deceit, just so long do we fail to improve others. That is, in our intercourse with others, the difference in our teaching or influence over others is measured by the deceit we seek to hide in ourselves.

The man who seeks to appear self-sacrificing and also hide his deceit will quickly denounce an argument as tending toward fatalism, or an irresponsibility for one's acts.

A government proclaimed to be "of the people" is but an imitation of natural law. All governments are of the people, and the inevitable force by which all motion is derived makes the power of the majority absolute. Man would destroy himself, if he possessed a knowledge by which he could rule others. Social happiness is limited to a method of intercourse, and the greatness of a nation depends upon the mutual means of expressing the desires of the will. We can build just as large as our mutual understanding will permit. Hence, methods of intercourse are vastly more important than what the character of the intercourse shall be. If our desires force us to progress, and the principle of elevation is illustrated by placing one brick upon another, civilization is but a tower of Babel that will reach its height when a confusion of understanding occurs. Our reason, therefore, must guide our action. If we decide that building higher and larger increases our happiness, our method of intercourse must be simplified; for nothing is clearer than the necessity of mutual means of intercourse before a large body of people can work together for a common object.


Technical methods are a restriction upon the theories of American Independence; and however extravagant methods of intercourse may become, the inconsistency is evident of pretending to help people up to a higher plane, by teaching technical words for the protection of those on

top. Surely, if the learned are honest in their proffered assistance, they could not justify the double definition of words which discloses an opposite purpose.

That men get and become more exalted is no proof they were assisted; also the effort to keep the masses down is revealed to them just as soon as they are compelled to serve. Whether it is a provision of Providence or not, it cannot be denied, that servants soon learn to serve themselves after being compelled to serve others; and nothing becomes more common than that servants become useless just as soon as they "know too much." Now, it is not consistent to pretend to teach servants and then seek to deceive them by a confused method of speech, for the apparent purpose of retaining their service.

That some were born to serve is theoretically exploded by the rapid growth of America. It is not due to what is taught in the public schools, so much as the system of government which made the public schools possible. The fact that they are public is vastly more important than what is taught. This is as clear as sunlight, when we observe the terrible wrangling of learned men over the control of the ethics to be taught. Now, that the very teaching of ethics carries with it an assumption of infallible ideas, it surely proves that two men equally learned, trying to convince each other of their infallible judgment, have a purpose toward those whom they would teach. If their own learning will not reveal to them their real position, it is all the more evident that the wisdom of God is only revealed to babes.

If a system of government could be perfect, the tower of Babel would have been continued to an endless height. Hence, the repeated attempts to renew a like structure with no better success, will not justify the principle by which governments compel the defenceless class to serve the learned. Neither will it disturb the theory of justice



because the administration of governments partake of the fallible character of man's works.

The learned have made no worse failure than in their efforts to establish literal ethics. We have always before us the example of Nature. Man's works are more nearly a perfect success when he follows his copy without seeking to improve it. Hence, if we admit the necessity of a government to regulate social affairs, the form which will perform this work in the most simple manner will be the most progressive. We can make no progress until we understand the relation of a government to the people composing it. If we are controlled by a literal authority which was prepared to justify the divine rights of the ruling official, the full force of a government "of the people" is not comprehended. That is, if we acknowledge a corrupt literature in support of a division of humanity, or that men the most learned, own and possess a *right* to teach the masses, the first principle of a popular government is exploded.

If men are morally bound to the legal tenets of a government that is controlled by a body of politicians in the interests of the rich or influential only, the practical effect of ancient literature is as potent in a "free government," as when children were taught that a king's power was absolute. The real spirit of a popular government is the equal opportunity for all, and if a system is possible in accord with what a republican form purports to be, it could not be controlled by an aristocracy as tyrannical as ever a kingdom was burdened with.

It is immaterial whether the masses of humanity are enslaved by chains, or taught an obedience to a government that is controlled by masters whose motive is to be served. That is, the principle is the same, and when we see men filled with the power of rhetoric, who continually condemn the poor and illiterate for their vicious habits, we

also observe their epicurean style of living, which betrays the motive and as surely condemns them.

The term, popular government, is a reproach to the simplest degree of common sense, unless the free expression of opinion is recognized. That such is the case now, is no more so than when men were burned at the stake. The only advance we have made is in the fact that civilized governments will tolerate free speech, if the speaker will protect himself—practically no advance at all.

No single individual can do more than act up to his own precepts and fearlessly expose the fallacies by which the learned strive to justify the possession of wealth, and also condemn the laborer for being so wicked as to be obliged to work. We are told about labor-saving machines, and yet we have more poverty and real misery, than when small communities produced all their necessities by hand labor. Surely, when half the people can be served by the other half, who must also bear the stigma of being wicked, the ideal government "by the people and for the people" has not been reached, unless what is meant by the people are only those who are elevated above the stigma of work.

The present social confusion is the result of trying to teach freedom and obedience both. Children are filled with the beauties of living in a free country, and their natural promptings of liberty are developed to the breaking strain. When they reach maturity it gradually creeps upon them that they are not free, that the social whip is as harsh as the whip of slavery. It is not strange that the cultured and those who are termed well-bred can see the apparent success of deception, and more readily choose the wrong than the right, but natural law is impartial, and no method of obtaining a living is better than earning it.

There is no reason why a people could not become as cultured, and enjoy all the luxuries of life, as well upon

honest principles as studied methods of deception. The force of knowledge is self-convicting ; it is only possible to suffer by the same force that reveals the right as well as the wrong. The desire to be served is the principle upon which social matters are stimulated, and when the old literature was purposely prepared to justify an exclusive class as the owners of every living creature they could force into service, it can well be seen how inconsistent it is to apply it to a country where the schools are public. There are no paupers more to be pitied than the book taught ; they are called educated, *but they are not learned.*

The literary tyranny of this age is a little less severe perhaps than that of the past, but the whip of scorn will not tolerate expression from people who are untrained to a specific measure of language. The man who is served in luxury will sneer at the simple expressions of the laborer, and the deceitfulness of this practice is exposed by the worshipping of wealth, the owner of which will be courted and flattered regardless of his literary acquirements.

The person who meets a reverse in life may look in vain for a helping hand, from those who declared themselves to be "everlasting friends." Yet the principle of confidence is no less a reality, for the doors of the poor and the oppressed laborer, who are condemned for their ill-bred manners, will be open to the man who dares to arouse the vengeance of people who parade an external affectation of cultivated manners.

It has been the entire aim and purpose of this book to show the absurdity of a government striving to maintain the spirit of aristocracy, and also flatter the laborers, or wage-workers, into the belief that a republican form of government is "of the people," regardless of their social standing, or literary training. That the spirit of what is termed a popular government is the reverse of an aristocratic form, is doubtless well understood ; also the well-

known fact that every person in a free country must earn their own freedom, makes ethical teaching in the special interest of a class division of society all the more ridiculous.

The authority to teach cannot be rightfully vested in the more elevated of society, and a right also to adopt such methods as will protect one-half of humanity in their assumed right to a support from the toil of the other half. The rich develop dignity in proportion to their wealth, and there is no question but what some of the most learned are poor, but the natural desire for luxuries, and the aversion for "manual toil," makes the learned man a firm believer in the potency of gold. No one can teach a system of ethics which will justify the teaching and relieve the teacher from a strict conformity to them. No one can be so learned as to satisfy his own desires and also show it to be right to teach others how they can restrain themselves.

It is immaterial to the principle of justice, whether a system of government can be formed to protect all in their natural rights, or not. It is enough to feel what real freedom is, and happiness is only to be had by earning it. Hence, the consciousness of what is right is the highest degree of happiness. We cannot assume to know what is right for another without denying the first principle of American independence. The ballot is no less than the expression of the popular will; it implies a difference of opinion. No one can be taught to have an opinion unless the will is disregarded.

The principle of slavery may have enlightened the world the same as a wrong act, but will it justify doing wrong, because it must occur before the right can be revealed? Now, when we discover that our ideas of what the duty of others are, cannot be expressed without an assumption of infallibility, the real merit of a popular government must be seen to rest upon the right to a differ-

ence in opinion. This must also include the right of judgment, and simply brings us to a conclusion that the identical act which is revealed to one as right, is as surely wrong to another.

The assumption that a spirit of obedience should be rendered toward the older people is derived from parental authority ; but such authority is naturally accounted for by the love the parent bears toward the child. It does not follow that people who are more learned can justify an authority over the unlearned, for the individual responsibility is recognized by the will, and also the infliction of a punishment by man for acts committed by his own kind. History shows clearly how impossible it is to formulate a correct system of literal ethics. The numerous versions of the Bible bear witness of its literal imperfection, while it reflects a perfection that the individual conscience only can comprehend. That is, it reflects the purity and deceptive character of man equally, also leaving the choice of the will poised equally between right and wrong. This shows that human teaching is subject to the same law, and also verified by observing two men disputing over a system of ethics which both claim an authority to teach. If we would only observe the one fact that civilization is derived from the liberty to learn, the oppressive character of teaching would be seen in its true light, and to such a mind the social problem would be solved.

It is needless to anticipate the result of an act of justice before approving it. Every person who can determine what is right for himself, should recognize the equal right of another to determine by the exercise of the same force, even if a contrary opinion is developed, for otherwise social intercourse would be impossible. Therefore, the right of suffrage as a general principle should be admitted without the assumption of a right to affix certain conditions bearing upon humanity unequally. It is use-

less to attempt to regulate justly such burdens as rents and taxes, and talk about the rights of the wage-workers, while the lesser number of the people are recognized as the rulers of the masses—practically masters or owners. If a just recognition of the American idea of government was forced upon the learned, there could be no ruling class receiving the special protection of a popular government. That a great deception must be constantly practiced to maintain this condition, explodes the theory that the illiterate could not be *given* the ballot without endangering *our free institutions*. Such words are meaningless, unless they mean an ownership, which in principle is human bondage regardless of the degree.

One can be honest in theory, even if the human race is ever to be unjustly dealt with by the learned as a class. Also, the learned man may wrap his mantle of dignity around his pet ideas; he cannot disguise to his equal in social standing the injustice that is practiced upon the people unlearned in special methods of deception. It is a simple problem to determine that the oldest people are the lesser number in proportion to their age, for otherwise the race would become extinct. The same rule applies to the learned, the wealthy, or the employers of laborers. It can be seen, therefore, that a political system is the protective barrier between the mass of the people and the ruling class. If this intervening wall is always to remain, the expression of the laboring people by ballot will not stand a logical test. In fact, it is as silly as to use words having a positive and negative meaning.

If suffrage means anything, it is the expression of the will regardless of the surrounding conditions. Besides, nothing would be more ridiculous than for the learned to pretend that the entire human race could rest comfortably on top of a pyramid of humanity. The theory of civiliza-

tion is like trying to build a chimney higher by taking the brick from its base. No man can vote a strict expression of his opinion above the degree of his knowledge. That is, if he voted direct for the measure, rather than for a man to represent him. Besides, two ignorant voters would neutralize the force of such a vote, and only by the assistance of a more learned man could this system be disturbed. Hence, is the country more in danger because the ignorant can lead, than it is from the ability of the learned to deceive them? Knowledge is truth, and it will rule regardless of the effort of man to make literal imagery, or words practical idolatry, its equivalent. Therefore, if a man honestly desires to solve the present social disorder, he will find at least enough to study, by examining the various methods of social intercourse. It naturally follows, when these methods become more mutual, an improved condition will occur.

It is no more dangerous to recognize the right for the people to vote direct for measures, than to vote for men who are controlled by a political party corrupted by the exclusive class of society. A simple yes or no vote would settle all measures of a government which could be presented by one assembly of legislators. It would at least recognize the principle of a government of the people. That is, the veto power would be directly in the hands of the people, and this fact would encourage the learned to reveal what they must know to be a great injustice. The people voting direct for measures would remove the vast source of corruption which the learned are as much bound to serve as ever slave was bound to serve a master. Hence, to recognize the force of liberty is to develop a larger community, until the whole earth could enjoy a peace which a mutual method of expression would make possible.

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS

FROM

THE STURDY OAK.



MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS.

AFRAID TO BE HONEST.

The right of opinion is a sacred right, but when a person expresses himself as believing in the necessity of deception, or a system of policy for fear of the influence of honesty upon crude humanity, he betrays a need for good influence himself. There is something the matter when a person is afraid to be honest.


Can any circumstances occur when a dishonest act will accomplish more than an honest one?

It is often claimed that it is better not to reveal to children or ignorant people the actual condition well-known by those more advanced in knowledge.

Will this justify a method of deception? Circumstances will occur when an honest admission or a deceptive course must be chosen. Mature knowledge will always reveal the deception that was previously taught, and does the good resulting outweigh the bad?

It is well-known that knowledge is constantly unfolding that which we were previously ignorant of; it suggests a suspicion that the amount of knowledge hidden from the wisest is of greater magnitude than that which is known. A man must have a motive for being dishonest, what is it? He hopes to benefit himself, but is always mistaken, for it costs more to be dishonest than the benefit amounts to. Honesty holds the balance of power, and a continued success from dishonest acts is as impossible as to keep a water-wheel in constant motion by using its power to pump the water back into the pond.

Man defies his common sense when he undertakes to be dishonest; he exposes the fact that he knows it by the effort he will make to disguise it. At every success of a



deceitful act, the man will add strength to his conceit. It adds to his feelings of importance and seems to increase his power. Under such an influence he will even proclaim it as an established principle that success in life depends upon being dishonest.

The possession of superior knowledge does not insure an honesty of purpose, for those who know the most are all the more familiar with deceptive ways. What is the matter with them? They are afraid to be honest, for the act will necessarily expose their previous dishonesty, and it takes more courage to admit a deceptive act than it does to perform it. Respectability can be maintained by the outward appearance of honesty; it is all that is required by what is termed "respectable society." Hence, the encouragement to be honest is not strengthened by the surrounding influence of respectability in such cultivated disguise. Besides, while the conscience is well informed of the rottenness of the craft it is inclosed in, the title of respectability will float it with the single condition of silence.

It is difficult to determine honesty from a point of observation, for whatever conclusion we may arrive at, we are most confounded by the confessions of such persons as enjoy the title of respectability and are spoken of as models of honesty. It makes a man deny his own existence to be told by a model man that only simpletons and fools were honest, that the affairs of society were controlled by flattery and hypocrisy, that "respectable people" pounce upon the man who dared to be honest, branding him a crank, or crazy, and if a man would keep up with the times he must keep his own opinions to himself.

Like the water-wheel that would try to pump its source of power back into the pond again, can society maintain its iniquity by pumping its virtue over to keep up an appearance of respectability? Men who are far


from pedants in knowledge will admit this condition of society in private conversation and deny it in public. Why? Because they are afraid to be honest, also it would be a confession of their previous dishonesty and their most intimate friends would give them the "go by" for fear their "virtue" also would be weighed in the scales of the public. Such have no choice, but are obliged to be shocked at the wickedness of others, for it is the special method of disguising one's own.

Hence, the courage is lacking, and the old-fashioned way that may be read of in books, to determine honesty by a clear conscience, is quite out of style. Yet civilization is as dependent as ever upon the individual courage to be honest. Science may determine ways and means to appropriate the powers of Nature, but no manufactured ethics from the wit of man will yield a more comfortable reward than the individual consciousness of acting in accord with honest convictions.

A SECRET BALLOT.

The legislature is the creature of the people, and from whence does it obtain its power to dictate to the creative power—the people—whether they shall vote secretly or not?

The inconsistency of a secret ballot must be obvious to a thinking man. It is a usurpation by legislatures to act upon so important a matter other than refer it to the people for a yes and no vote. To make a law without prescribing a penalty would be a dead law, and in the case of a man being punished for refusing to comply to a condition of secrecy, compelling a man to be free for the sole purpose of robbing him of the privilege. The politic manner by which the general writer speaks of the people seems to convey the idea that a few men only, possessing



special qualifications, have the right to control the government of the masses, yet how inconsistent to acknowledge the right of a man to vote, if he will submit to being told how he shall vote. A trained vote is the same as a true lie.

There are people who pretend to write and express the thoughts of the silent one, and to a keen observer, such betray their motive more surely than silence can be deciphered.

There are probably less than one hundred men who practically have entire control of the political affairs of this country. There is no real difference between the magnates of both parties. They confer with each other as a united body, and their shrewd actions are scarcely ever betrayed, for the representatives of both parties are mutually dependent upon making the people believe they are really voting for something. It makes a deal of noise, but it is a wicked farce. These men are as autocratic as kings. Presidents are puppies in comparison. They control the great papers which pretend to voice the people, but with that audacity which implies : What are you going about it ?

How ridiculous it is to even talk about benefiting the people by advocating the secrecy of the ballot. It seems to imply that the whole world, scattering planets and all, belong to these autocrats. They talk about conferring the ballot upon poor illiterate people, while they are so ignorant as not to know how outrageously they are abused. Yet these great magnates are afraid our free institutions are in danger. The people are the ballots themselves ; they *took* the right to express themselves by voting, or even the pretense of self-governments would be denied them by the same spirit that would cheat the people out of the result, because they were too ignorant to defend


themselves ; and yet we often hear about the dangerous classes.

The character of the plant is always the same, regardless of its culture, and there is no evidence that the culture of human plants changes the character of human nature. While it is comparatively easy to cultivate a hundred men, it would be a puzzle to select the single one of that number that could bear popularity. The ambition for glory in human nature may push the world along, but such men are more dangerous than those who are so ignorant as not to know how. Even cultured men love money, and autocrat rulers not only love the money, but their position enables them to legalize its value.

The trouble is not with the ballot in the hand of an ignorant man, but it is in the corrupting influence of the crowd of satellites that besiege the great political magnates. The system of government is constantly being swelled to absorb this eager crowd ; while all the wickedness is "charged up" to the ignorant people because they cannot comprehend the account. But nothing has been discovered yet that would stand a continual swelling, and therefore no prophet is needed to foretell the inevitable result.

Such traffic will continue, however, whether the ballot is secret or public ; yet it is the human privilege to act secretly ; but when the general public is concerned in the act, it implies a fraud, for honesty knows no fear.

The more universal the privilege of obtaining knowledge becomes, the more the shabby treatment of the common people by their pretended rulers is exposed. All the records of the past show one prominent feature. All rulers of the people have coaxed, flattered, trained, and compelled the general mass of humanity to serve the few, who claimed the right by the power to do it. A real democratic government is not possible, until the people learn



how they have been imposed upon. The text-books used in schools are purposely prepared to bias the mind of youth, hence the civilization of the earth is retarded. The fact is, however, a knowledge of language must first be taught before evil training is possible; and this simple knowledge will gradually open the eyes of the innocent people, who are ignorant of the injustice that is imposed upon them. The effort to disguise the real object, is the first principle of politics, and to protect this intermediate meddling between the people and the government, is what the pretense of "ballot reform" really means. There is no record that shows the difference in the love of man for each other, more than their own record before and after election. What the people want is a real democratic government, when men and women can vote as they please, and what they please, without being bribed, trained or told how, by those who are more interested in their own wants than in the wants of others.

WHO DOES THE BALLOT BELONG TO? \ \ () :


If a man has anything given to him it belongs to him, and it is equally his privilege to decide from whence it came; he certainly had no choice until his life became an established fact. It would, therefore, seem that life and the consciousness of it was all that any one could really claim as belonging to him; certainly no one could dispute a man's right to a clear title to his life, for he never had to beg, steal or fight for it, until it was thrust upon him without a consideration of whether he was willing or not. Now, when he finds himself possessed with it, and also sees others that appear to possess the same element, the most natural thing in the world would be to compare notes with each other. Such is the limit of human nature.

A vote or ballot represents a human life, as much as a word represents a truth or falsehood. Systems of balloting are methods of ascertaining the relative force that can be depended upon from a body of men, who possess courage enough to appropriate any particular piece of a planet they may happen to be located upon. They have no choice of planets by reason of the law of gravity, which, however, does not deter the ambitious man from striving to overcome it. Without this wonderful law Adam could not have been placed upon the earth; neither would anyone have been concerned about getting up in the world, for without this adhesive attachment to the earth, the prayers of all would be for some method to keep us down. It would thus seem to be of more importance for a man to "know" where he was than any particular condition of the location that he was placed in.

This word know or knowledge is very important, for it represents consciousness, a sense of one's self, which is also represented by a ballot or a musket. The greatest merit of a ballot is, that it will determine the numerical strength of a body of men without the barbarous custom of a resort to a test of brute force; simply reason against power.

Now, a vote being as sacred to a man as his life, he will never be convinced that he is indebted to any other man or body of men for what they are equally in limbo about.

The fact is, no injustice is possible for man greater than that by which he is able to perform by a developed condition of knowledge, which also seems to generate ignorance, if the man claiming to be learned is sincere, when he calls another ignorant, who gives evidence of being conscious of his own, what belongs to him—his existence.



All the instruction or acquired knowledge a man needs is enough to expose to his vision the deceit of those who are informed. A vote is directly derived from that which is first known to man—his existence. It is indirectly controlled by the influence which man is able to exert upon his fellow-man. In the absence of intent it is a source of development. No man is indebted for his rights, for they were forced rather than conferred upon him. A majority is always right, for by that tenure only is a body of men entitled to a particular portion of the earth. The force of nature proves this assertion, for the reproduction of the race is more rapid in proportion to the illiteracy of the people. A variety of causes are constantly destroying mankind, but no intelligent observer can show any one cause as destroying more human beings than the ambition for knowledge and popular glory. The very nature of things loads man with all he can bear, and what develops an individual is more the knowledge of how much he can bear without breaking, than any particular degree. Whenever a man can carry his load easy, he will be required to carry more if he would continue to carry a comfortable load.

Liberty is the natural power of existence, and for any man to claim sincerely that he must be trained in any ethical direction is foolish, for he must "know" better, or he is practically dead and foolish by reason of his not knowing it. The fraud of general training stands out upon its face, and what is termed ignorance is really all the honest knowledge there is, in the sense that the development of knowledge is impossible without exposing the liberty to do evil. Hence, no man could vote wrong, for he could not "know" how until he was trained.

WHAT IS AUTHORITY?

All evil and all oppression is the outcome of knowledge, to obtain which man is compelled to, by instinct—as much so as the most minute insect.

The master never enlightens the slave, hence just in proportion to a man's obtaining knowledge will he pass from the ranks of the oppressed to the ranks of the oppressor. He, as a rule, will treat ignorant people in the same manner as he was treated.

This shows the power of knowledge, which is not conferred upon men by each other, but is as much forced upon him as his birth. Besides, every person possessing knowledge can look both ways; he can look down upon those who are ignorant, and also observe others looking down upon him. Hence, ignorance and knowledge are in mutual embrace.

It is only by reason of man's knowing how, that he can do an injustice to his fellow-man. Surely there could be no responsibility attached to an act in the absence of knowledge. Man can seek knowledge, but really has no idea of what particular kind he will receive, until he receives it. Therefore, man seeks out that which he cannot select from until he knows what it is; and the birth of knowledge is the same as the material birth.

We feel that what we know ourselves constitutes knowledge, by reason of observing those who are ignorant of what we know. It is equivalent to a man standing beside a statue of wood and berating it for not possessing the knowledge of its own existence, while the man himself was in the same position in regard to abstract knowledge.

Knowledge depends upon ignorance, the same as the body upon food, for in the absence of ignorance there would be nothing to learn; also doing right depends upon the knowledge of knowing what is wrong. It is therefore

an obvious fact that in proportion to the development of knowledge, the disposition in man to keep getting something with the least trouble to himself will also develop. This accounts for the oppression of whoever or whatever is ignorant of the means of defence.

Now, the sense of knowledge once obtained, is equally fixed without the power to obtain it ; whatever would destroy the one principle, would also destroy the other ; and while it is necessary to possess the knowledge of defence, it also teaches the means of offence to those behind. It shows plainly that reason and power can never embrace without the absolute destruction of the race.

All the scholarly authorities have no more effect upon the natural order of progress, than the trimmings upon the soldiers' uniforms have upon the result of a battle. Authority simply represents the conceit of a man in his effort to monopolize the fruit of knowledge ; but the fact that scholars, as a class, are more rapidly destroyed, proves that what is taught as evil, is developed in greater proportion than that which is termed good.

Man has no power to resist the receiving of knowledge, for the very oppression he receives is not only a form of knowledge, but also incites him to seek the means of defence. It must be acknowledged that natural ignorance is always honest, and only upon the advent of knowledge is dishonesty possible.

Therefore, it is this placing of knowledge, by the conceit of those possessing it, in the ascendancy to a road to greater goodness, that makes it an evil by the same logic. Man knows this fact, or he does not know how to do wrong ; showing also that his first knowledge was how to do right ; and no better proof is needed than the fact that he will do wrong.

The elevation of man, and also what progress the race make as a whole, depends upon the crude principle of

honesty. For no degree of education, culture, popularity or wealth, will save a man from destruction, if he lets go his hold to the truth. He may seem to succeed to the eye of envy, for wickedness will make a great parade, and spring up quick; but the truth will travel right along, perhaps very slow, but it never gets tired. Thus, the unchangeable truth is the real authority for man to be governed by, rather than the manufactured, which knowledge enables men to impose upon each other as the real article; and the only method of knowing the truth is by the individual consciousness of one's own existence.

POLITICAL CORRUPTION.

Politics is but legalized corruption. Honest politics is as impossible as honest stealing; it possesses no moral virtue, and is only sustained legislative enactments, the power of which being insufficient to establish a legal right upon an equal footing with a moral right.

A manufactured right is a deception, a mere decoy to deprive a person of his actual right, the inherent virtue of which is embodied with existence. The science of politics possesses no merit in the civilization of mankind; its results and actual motive is oppressive; it defrauds the masses of humanity under the guise of pretended assistance. A political system of any character robs the citizen of all the virtue there is to the ballot—that is, to the right of opinion; it simply presents the alternative to the voter to choose between two wrongs.

The very significance of politics is a scheme, and what is the value of a vote that is controlled by a scheme? Men who appear respectable and give evidence of cultivation will exclaim about the need of purifying politics. Could anything be more inconsistent?

Honest politics would destroy the need for such a system, and no man can be well informed, who is not aware that a political system is for the protection of the exclusive class of society, who are thus enabled to appropriate the product of industry while presenting the appearance of conferring upon their serfs a privilege of permitting them to serve.

Universal suffrage is merely the right to exist, and the freedom of man gives him the power to enslave his kind. He proclaims it to be right to declare that inferiors are wicked, and then tries to compel them to serve as a penalty for an existence of which there was no choice.

The cultured man, or the educated man, knows of this injustice toward humanity. He pretends a series of excuses, in his endeavor to prove that might is right. If logically considered, it would expose the deception of the man of knowledge; for were he sincere in his pretended effort to assist his fellow-men, he would cling to a political system that robs even the cultured man of his right of suffrage. It is a fallacy to claim a necessity for a political system to obtain the expression of a large mass of humanity.

The convictions of mankind are inherent and not subject to the influence of those who purposely confound the power to act, with the right to act. This insincerity of pretending to benefit others is always exposed when the "spoils" are divided. The man who will consume the entire product of the very men he would reform, is too selfish to be honest. For an educated man to claim a right to dictate the method of government for helpless mortals, who are simply compelled to support exclusive idleness, is always inconsistent, when he uses his power in appropriating to himself all the luxury derived from serf labor.

It is the necessities that compel man to labor, and it is no reason that such as are ignorant of a method of defence, are a common prey for men whose very knowledge exposes the fact that they know better. All a man wants, or needs, is the opportunity ; he is not unwilling to work and develop himself. Such men as those who perform no labor whatever, are mere impostors when they pretend to benefit one laborer by robbing the product of another. The world is civilized by the principle of honesty, and only obstructed by fraud. Hence, the honest man should never hesitate in expressing his opinion unbiased by political influence.

INCONSISTENCY.

It is a severe contradiction to proclaim the necessity for a man to work himself up by his own effort, and then endeavor to teach a system of dependence upon those who have reached an elevated position. Surely a man rises by his own efforts, or he is obligated to some other power, and the sham of helping others up in life is exploded by the fact that those who are up are more dependent than those who are down, for it requires no energy of effort to stay down.

PATIENCE.

We often hear people remark that they have no patience with the ideas some people will advance, but the language of man will reflect his character in spite of his effort to conceal it ; and when we observe others with indifference, feeling ourselves a sense of pity for those who cut such a senseless figure, we may be assured also, that our opinion is but the reflection of an ignorant mind. We can think what we choose about others, but what others

think of us determines our degree of elevation. The boldness with which people express their knowledge is simply stimulated in proportion to the little they know, for the person who dares to advance beyond the circle of his training will discover no greater surprise than the fact that his ignorance becomes more apparent as knowledge expands.

RESPECTABILITY.

It seems to be conclusive evidence that a person is honest who can wear the title of respectability, regardless of being honest. Of course, the individual conscience is more comfortable to carry when honesty is strictly adhered to, but the rage for popularity will engage the energy of the ambitious man, until he attempts to adjust all the circumstances of life to his own desires. He will become hardened in whatever course he pursues. He knows he is dishonest, but will wear a serene air of indifference in the presence of others.

This superficial respectability is very misleading to the simple mind that possesses the natural instinct of honesty. Now, the true spirit of honesty is more in the courage to cling to firm convictions, than the mere title which others may apply to us; and the honest man, who could be tempted to exchange his personal convictions of what is honest for the empty honors showered upon the so-called respectability, proves himself to be lacking in the necessary courage to be honest. We often think others are happy when we gaze upon the surface that respectability covers, but that is the most misleading decoy that the devil ever conceived, and no one should exchange their own convictions of what is honest for the delusion of appearances.

THE CONFUSION OF LANGUAGES.

All persons educated in the same school will convey their opinions understandingly to each other, and it is a great injustice to apply the stigma of ignorance to a person who may be unacquainted with a specific form of expression. No one can possess knowledge without being ignorant also, and none is more foolish than to attribute to a form of language any degree of knowledge.

The fact that useful knowledge is possible to be obtained, suggests that a simple method of language would be the most beneficial.

A motive is also apparent for the extravagant words and conflicting definitions applied to them. It surely betrays a suspicion that the authorities for the proper language is purposely arranged to oppress the common people who are compelled to serve by reason of being ignorant of a simple language whereby they could express their opinions understandingly. It is too common an error for a sensible man to exclaim of another that he has no opinion, when he is only lacking in a knowledge of the present extravagant form of language.

WAS ADAM TEMPTED?

It may be interesting to consider the claim that Adam was tempted to taste the apple previous to the knowledge the taste conveyed. He was therefore forced instead of having been tempted, for no blind man could be tempted to see when he was not even conscious of being blind. It does look as if a man was not to blame for rolling down hill, if he was unconscious of the necessary sense to be disturbed about it. Besides, if a man must let go his hold to obtain the sense of being up, it proves his fall to have been a benefit to later generations, who use

the sense thus obtained to blame Adam for letting go of the bliss of ignorance.

WHO BELIEVES IT?

The great height that a multitude of people are attaining, by various reasons, such as culture, wealth, popular glory and the like, has a great attraction for those below. The masses are trained to believe there is room enough on top, but it must be known to those who are on the way toward the top, that the higher walks of life depends upon servants as a base for the top to rest upon.

All schools of training are a unit upon the principle of protecting the few who claim a right to rule by reason of *knowing how*. They all teach that blessings come from above. Yes, we get sunshine, but if a man climbs over all the obstructions in his path until he reaches middle life, he discovers all else of a tangible character comes from below. Hence, upon general principles, the few people who become a little elevated very graciously bemoan the suffering among the common people; it is a pretense to disguise their own desires to get higher. Their eagerness becomes greater the higher they get, while they are continually boasting of the favors they bestow upon the people below, such as training them to be obedient, and particularly grateful for being *helped* up.

The principle of assistance toward each other is no doubt a fact, and no less so than that it is, at least, under the indirect control of natural law, so it makes little matter whether the following question is ever settled or not. What particular class of beings are entitled to the credit of civilizing the earth? A man of mere natural sense can determine, at least, that it is the common people that hold the elevated ones up; and if we are all pulled up, the

earth might float away and evolve another race of beings, which we would like to become acquainted with. This is not new philosophy, but is so true that it will bear being repeated at the pleasure of all writers.

The luxury of elevating a few people for the purpose of amusing the general mass of humanity, may be some excuse, but, no doubt, the real reason is, that so many are "willing" to be elevated. Therefore, who believes that the great results from human life depends upon the elevated few, who are constantly betraying their own anxiety for fear their dependence for support will take a little rest? A very small truth may be hidden in a vast amount of falsehood and rubbish, but it adds nothing to the value of the gem by being so generously protected.

ETERNAL FORCE.

Power is inevitable force resulting from the eternal agitation of material existence, equivalent to life, and the very essence of liberty. Individual consciousness, the power of reason and intelligence are synonymous. Power of action is liberty of action, regardless of the influence that causes the action, for if the individual can only act by reason of some influence, the action of influence would in justice be responsible. Thus fatalism would be established, and no excuse for teaching, training or punishment would be right, for to act from an influence beyond the control of the act would make it utterly impossible to do wrong.

The reflective power, consciousness, the knowledge of existence, must possess an individual identity, and every act will develop the element of reason, which is absolutely individual, or the power to perform an act is right by reason of the power to act. No one needs to be taught this

simple philosophy, for every creature conscious of their existence knows it, and betrays the fact by stepping to one side of a post, rather than attempting to go through it.

This dissolves the great social problem into one simple question: Have the exclusive class of general society the right to govern the common class because they possess the power to do it? And the same question in another form: Should the common people be punished for acting as they were trained to act, or should those who taught them receive the punishment? Does the earth owe its existence to the flowers that bloom, or should the flowers respect the earth? Is that which is developed superior to that which it is developed from?

The liberty to act, or power to act, embraces reason only when the privilege to do wrong can control the same force as the privilege to do right. The knowledge of what is right is only demonstrated when the acts are shown to be consistent with the material relations between intelligence and the common power of ignorance, from which intelligence springs, and as much dependent upon its source—ignorance—as the flower is upon the earth.

DOES THE "WORLD" GROW BETTER?

If a person has real charity for the free expression of opinion, he will also display a spirit of fairness by a careful study of the present social disturbance. Doubt is the mother of progress, but as one can progress in a wrong direction it does not answer the question: Does the "world" grow better? A sick man will exclaim: It grows worse, while the man who enjoys a period of health will at such a time declare: Of course the world grows better, and none but grumblers will bother their head about such a question.

The will is a factor that cannot be discarded in social matters, and while we admire the Golden Rule, we break it every time we apply it to others, and fail to see how we admire and honor those who agree with us. Even flattery is more readily accepted than any rebuttal of a pet idea. Hence the character of the will should be carefully considered by those who would act in accord with a professed desire to benefit society at large—humanity—or even a specific circle. Society acts upon the will as a temptation and also combats a free will as a reaction against the greed this freedom will always develop. That is, society governs without the power to control, as such power would destroy the free character of the will. Society would make the individual believe that a free will was a myth, while the inspiration of freedom is of a character so self-revealing that no one needs to be taught its force.

A person can do worse than cultivate a doubt when he feels that any particular expression of an individual will endanger society. Sunlight could as well fear darkness, for expression is but freedom of the will, and who can believe that society would not destroy itself if all hearts should beat as one and the expression of one was but the echo of another.

The reader, however, could exclaim: Surely the "world" grows better for "everybody" believes that. Are you really convinced that the "world" grows better? It may be considered as meaning the same: Do the people grow better? Now let a little doubt gather in your mind, and will it not reveal that the individual grows, but society as a whole does not grow, any more than the shadow of a stick could be greater if cut into pieces than when it was whole. Of course if we are growing better, we must admit of a period when we were worse, and the importance of maintaining the question of natural depravity is no greater than the necessity of this mooted question remaining un-

settled. Matter must have space enough to move in or its force is immaterial. Also moral teachers would be silenced if their ethics were undisputed.

We are therefore brought to a limitation when we try to imagine a state of conscious improvement. If the individual reasons from the principal of analogy, he becomes confounded by his inability to compare all the surroundings of the two objects compared. It would seem better for him who would reason in accord with the Golden Rule to admit that individual growth was as dependent upon the imperfection of human affairs as the entire race is upon the ignorance of birth. Light is as dependent upon darkness to be visible as a hole is upon its surroundings.

The self-revealing law of consciousness is not deprived from will power, for its priority is as essential as space is for light. Because our conception will not take us backward, it only reveals with greater force the fathomless character of infinite existence. Literal records reveal their reflective character, and the will must choose between the real that is revealed by conception and its power of reflection, before growth is possible, or what might be termed an improved condition. This applies to the individual will, for society is governed by the mutual understanding of words, or any method of intercourse.

Hence, we reach the conclusion that the person who is sincere in the belief of natural depravity is equally bound to believe that the "world" is growing better. But individual growth must necessarily stop at such a decisive judgment. That is, the man who can decide such an important question reveals the action of his will. He chooses to exercise his power within a circle of which he prescribes the lines. He reveals his own timidity, although within his chosen lines he parades courage, and by his precepts he moves, but in practice he stands still.

Doubt, therefore, is the mother of progress, and could a choice of birth be as possible as our choice of action after birth, the seeking of knowledge would have been a contrariety; for to know what one was seeking would be like carrying a lantern to reveal daylight. The principle of teaching is confounded with the desire to learn, and although moral teachers are not necessarily hypocrites, they surely betray a sterility to the extent they declare themselves to be in possession of a knowledge of the duty of others, and thereby seal their own privilege to develop.

To govern the will by outside influences is a contradiction of what the will is, as revealed by conception. The will to be such must be free, for to obstruct it destroys its character, and the responsibility of one's acts. When the will ceases to be self-governing, it is the evidence of a wrong choice of action, when self-interests will predominate over any regard for the welfare of others. Society must necessarily be governed, and the variety of forms is evidence that no definite one is derived from the power of Providence. It could even be considered that governments of society were no better than when kings proclaimed their divine authority, but what is better, is the methods of intercourse, and whether we are going toward a state of perfection that would put a limit to development, or not, the more people realize that the rights of others are identical with their own, the less we suffer and the more we feel that our own happiness reflects the happiness of others.

CO-EDUCATION OF THE SEXES.

The natural faculties need no stimulation by a restriction of the innocent association of children, or adults even. It is the public character of association that promotes good morals, and the teaching of morality has always been

subordinate to the example. The authority for teaching moral ethics is founded upon the supposition of natural depravity, and such a supposition is contradicted by the principle of American independence. The one principle or the other must be accepted to even be theoretically consistent, for the practical exercise of freedom and also a dependence upon the teaching of art is absurd. We must recognize the evil of art as the means by which society or intercourse is established. We even learn and move by this volatile process, and no amount of theories will correct a principle to which the present race, at least, are indebted for existence. Government can regulate, but it cannot maintain, or enforce, an authority over the natural order of human affairs.

We must recognize how absurd it is to acknowledge a state to possess an authority to determine what is moral, and immoral, when it would assume a parental position over its own mother. There is no state of society that can be above the family relations, and when we examine the two principles of forming a government the state authority should be determined thereby. If we recognize the rights of the people to form a state by popular suffrage we must, to be consistent, divorce the state from any former allegiance.

There is no feature of civilization more prominent, under improved forms of government, than a greater freedom for women. It dawns more and more upon the sterile mind of man that woman does not belong to him, he does not *own* her, and the more *public* society becomes the more a nation progresses.

It is natural for men and women to exist upon the same planet, and why should they be educated separately? The governments of the past have been controlled by men, and if the moral welfare of women was carefully guarded, men took good care also that their own immor-

ality was justified, and that woman should be taught seclusion and obedience. It is from the old forms of government that the exclusive teaching of women takes its rise, and whatever opinion the wise heads of the present may have, it is pretty clear that social conditions will not be turned backward, and also that the suffrage of the people will be extended rather than restricted.

Of course there are multitudes of authorities from eminent writers to show the corrupting influences from an unrestricted association of the sexes; but in our zeal to promote morality, we should not overlook parental love as the supreme source in which the innocence of youth is guarded. The sovereignty of the home is above the State, regardless of all wisdom that man has developed. Art can never control the artisan any more than a shadow can control the object from which it is reflected. Parental neglect could be cited to show the importance of State interference with home sovereignty, but is not the love of the parent superior to the self-love of men who assume to perform the functions of State? When it can be seen that the civil State is but the shadow of the marriage state, social affairs will be considered from the right standpoint. Men who are not above self-interest cannot justly rest their claim of domestic interference upon parental neglect, for there is no love of a higher order than the parental, and a seeming neglect of parents to guard the moral welfare of their children is far less than men who seek to disguise their selfishness under the official garb of State authority.

This question of co-education of the sexes is embraced within the authority of established customs, but we must accept one of the following positions to make our logic correct. Are civil governments derived from the will of the people or from literal authority which is based upon the Divine authority of men rulers? Will the records of

the past justify the claim of men in looking after the moral welfare of women? Women express their opinions of course, but the great question is, do men possess a moral right to dictate lines of division between the sexes, in defiance of an equal right of women to refuse the arrogance of assumed authority of men over women? Will the principle of suffrage warrant the assumption of the Divine authority of one sex over the other.

A DIRECT VOTE OF THE PEOPLE.

There is a cause for the present social disorder which every person interested in good government should investigate. Do the people rule, and if not, why? Nature rules by the ignorance of the majority, while art rules by the knowledge of how to do it. We have in theory a "popular government," in practice, a political system, which can only be maintained by the influence of knowledge and the protection of the learned class of society. Is there any written record when this class of people ever bestowed a franchise upon the ignorant, of any practical value? If the ignorant are deficient in the necessary knowledge to vote, are they as responsible for the disorder as men learned in methods of deception, by which the ignorant are robbed of their toil, and also taught that they have a voice in the government that pretends to protect them.

The intervention of politics is a science to prevent the industrious people from voting in a united body; it practically destroys the theory of a popular government, and this subject must be kept before the people as a standing defiance to political corruption. The politician, the tax collector and the store keeper will defend their "calling," for liberty is never bestowed, it must be earned by careful study and a fearless investigation.

A popular government in practice could only be derived from a majority of the people, but from the fact that the learned are always in the minority, the principle of voting would seem to be a contrariety. It should be at least apparent to the learned that the principle of voting implied a controlling influence of the majority, or the operation is a useless waste. Abstract knowledge cannot command its own source, and for that reason, what is generally understood as "learning," or "learned men," must always represent the minority. Yet we have to face the knowledge in the form of experience or conception, which is surely in the majority as abstract knowledge is in the minority. Learning, therefore, does not give to a man a clear title of ownership to the unlearned who are equally in possession of conceived knowledge.

If nature is responsible for the reproduction of the race it is no less a truth that she depends upon the ignorant or untaught, and nothing could be more unjust than to charge ignorance as being criminal or depraved when we all are indebted to this principle for our personal consciousness. A man may possess more abstract knowledge than his father, but would that justify an authority over the ethical conduct of the father? If such premise is correct, the principle of suffrage is too deceptive to possess any element of civilization. Because a nation appears in an external garb which reflects virtue by proxy, and possesses the knowledge of hiding its vice and poverty from the ears of sham refinement, it is no reason that its laws reflect more wisdom than the innocence of ignorance. It surely does not betray any right to deprive a man from using his light or lesser degree of knowledge because of an abstract production that is able to intimidate and assume a parental authority.

The theory of franchise is to obtain the popular will, and ethical questions are no exceptions to such will.

Therefore, this privilege is dissolved into a system which will the more nearly accomplish this purpose. Conception, experience, or real knowledge cannot be represented by proxy, and the representative form of government could never represent the popular will. Hence, a direct vote of the entire people, or the privilege to vote, is a possibility and every honest person should advocate some method by which the expression of the people could be had direct for the measure, rather than a dependence upon a political system which merely protects a premium on vice.

THE VIRTUE OF THE BALLOT.

Nature rules regardless of all the ethics which the learned formulate. The power of money gives merely the appearance of ruling, for good is the result of a cultivation of injustice, yet the moral obligation is a duty that cannot be bought or sold ; it clings to the individual ; it is the price of freedom.

Suffrage is not the gift of a government ; it is every one's right in proportion to the obligation involved. Man's obligation is a void beyond his individual knowledge ; he cannot exercise a power which he neither possesses nor has any knowledge of. It is therefore clear that no one can vote of their own volition beyond the measure of their knowledge. This being a fact, it must also be conceded that the only virtue the ballot possesses is the untrammelled expression of opinion.

The owning of voters takes various forms, and is derived from the barbarous custom of chattel slavery. It is very pretentious for any one to attempt to justify one form of slavery and condemn another. Property in man is principle of injustice whether the circle of individual liberty is widened or not. From whatever cause that one

man assumes the right to the natural power of another, it is practically in conflict with the principle of popular government.

It is as presumptuous for a master to give freedom to a slave, as for a thief to claim a virtue for restoring goods which he had stolen; man cannot give what is the common inheritance of all—freedom. Because he can restrain this principle which is a moral right, he claims to give it, and also to insist upon whatever compensation he chooses to enforce. No man can restrain the freedom of another without admitting the principle, and his inconsistency lies in depriving others of what he claims for himself. The ethical feature as pertaining to the welfare of society is more an excuse than any interest in the social well-being of humanity. No man can justly claim a right to guide the natural powers of another, and appropriate the product for his personal benefit. If the power to do it in the pretended interest of morality makes it right, it destroys the principle of morality by assuming it depends upon power.

If the possession of money or specific knowledge gives to man a moral right to either buy the voter or train him how to vote, the principle of directing a government by the force of the ballot is a silly farce. Civilization advances in proportion as the ownership in man decreases. It makes no difference to a result, by reason of the cause being claimed by any particular class of men. The general result of natural law is not affected by the individual freedom, for man's desires to obtain the best of a bargain in the commerce of merchandise or ideas, would destroy every living thing but for the ignorance of the majority.

Learned men exclaim, with a look of fear upon their features, "are we to be ruled by the ignorance of the masses?" The example of nature has always been the model for man to fashion his works by, and it is difficult

to conceive how the art of man can overcome the liberal profusion by which ignorant mortals are thrust upon the earth. The best government is that which governs the least, and admitting the inability of man to improve upon his model, how can man do better than study the principle by which natural law is enforced.

In a natural sense the majority rules. Therefore, if government is necessary to social happiness, and the struggles of humanity have developed the ballot as a method of expression, why not be honest and develop this principle. It is impossible to own men and admit their right of expression. The principle of suffrage will not admit of the right of property in man in any form whatever.

DO WOMEN DESIRE TO BE EXCLUSIVE?

The disposition of exclusiveness in a social sense is derived from the science of education. Now, the greatest difficulty to be overcome before women can possess a ballot upon the same footing with men is the cultivated desire for exclusiveness. Nothing but a just understanding of the rights of common humanity will give to woman suffrage the necessary consistency to become a fact. The suffrage that men "enjoy" is derived from the cultivated power of maintaining an exclusiveness.

This principle, even were it just, could do no more than admit women into the counsel of what is termed politics. But the fact that the magnates having entire control of all kinds of political organization derive their power by an educational exclusiveness, is the reason women are excluded. The act would endanger the present political system more than it would strengthen it.

It is reasonable logic to say: If men know they are deceiving the illiterate of their own sex and are thus in comparative peace, so far as controlling legislation is con-

cerned, they will not take on a load that will either expose the deception of politics, or add to the already cumbersome of the machine.

It is no less just, however, that woman suffrage should become a fact at an early day; but in connection with such a fact, it is equally just that common humanity should be acknowledged as possessing the same right. Hence, the present educational system (also in political control) is what is debarring the women from their just right. How? Because the present system is so entirely in the control of those who at present enjoy exclusive privileges, and if extravagance and a desire for luxurious idleness is not directly taught, it is permitted to be encouraged. For otherwise it would expose the well-known fact that the exclusive class of society are in more fear of the common illiterate laborers learning the true condition of things which excludes them socially. Therefore, to maintain extravagant methods of education excludes the poor, who are thrown into confusion and prevented from acting in concert by the terrible confusion of language. Whose fault is it, may well be asked. It is the fault of every individual who knows by reason of his own action in defrauding the laborer, that the object of politics is to protect exclusives or aristocracy. The silence of such men make their wickedness proportional to the knowledge they possess. Neither man nor woman can possibly receive real happiness derived from the acting wrong or withholding a knowledge of it, and pretend that innocent ignorance is to blame for that which their own knowledge so plainly reveals.

THE RELATION OF EMPLOYER TO EMPLOYEE.

There is no temptation that tries a man more than the successful acquirement of money. It gives to a man a power which can readily be magnified until all power is defied. It reveals a love of authority which was latent previous to the possession of money. Every healthy person wants something, and happiness depends upon the elevation of our wants as fast as minor ones are received. It is not strange, therefore, that the one great want is for money.

Now, while it is honorable to want, and a natural impossibility to grow or progress, without this stimulating influence, a just consideration for the rights of others is an important factor to reach substantial success. The cultivation of any desire will increase the desire in proportion to its being gratified. Hence, greed cannot be satisfied, and no slave was ever bound by a chain as securely as a greedy man is to his money. A man can only be happy when he is honest, and to be honest is a privilege, upon which monopolies and patent rights have no effect.

Naturally, the laborer is more independent than the capitalist, but the greedy employer will seek to make the employee as dependent as possible. When success is measured by the mere getting of money, it would appear on the surface that an honest man must be a poor man, and the timid laborer is made to contribute to his own destruction through fear of gaining the ill-will of his employer. Ethical teaching is derived from slavery; it teaches obedience to the employer, and parades the disastrous results of a disobedience. The necessary courage, therefore, to throw off the yoke of oppression, becomes weaker and weaker as fear becomes cultivated by the kind of teaching that is willingly paid for by the capitalist.

We hear about the necessity of capital, but the capi-



talist is no more than a man, and the necessity of capital to conduct large enterprises, suggests the words, owner and master, to identify the capitalist. This makes a confusion, for the necessity of capital does not embrace a necessity for the capitalist ; also coupled with the apparent necessity is the superficial evidence of successful money-making by the most unscrupulous men.

Domestic ties are the strongest bonds by which the laborer is controlled, and the capitalist, like the devil, will spare no means to accomplish his purpose. The promptings of love—desire—want—will control the strongest man. Hence, through the medium of family ties does the unscrupulous employer compel the laborer to serve ; that is, to be a dependent and a slave merely in another form. The present form of government as now conducted, is no protection to the laborer, for while the capitalist can control politics, he can control the government ; and the mere proclaiming a people free is an assumption of a gift, or something conferred by the body politic upon the masses of humanity, It therefore deceives the thoughtless man, and the spirit of obedience is so hardened that a conscious perception of what liberty means is impossible in the absence of an experience.

LIBERTY AND POLITICS.

Politics is not a necessity to the individual. The man who feels the full force of what real independence of character means, will stand alone fearlessly. We often hear that politics are a necessity, but it being equally true that a free man would be impossible if bound to such a necessity, the relation of politics to the individual is clear.

The first thing for the individual to settle for himself is, whether politics are a necessity to himself or not : whether he has the courage to be independent, or instead

to serve those who have a choice between serving and exercising the individual right of freedom is a practical proof that freedom is possible. But having chosen a position of servitude, the burden must be born, for nothing is truer in human affairs than that the responsibility of a choice is an individual necessity to the freedom of the will. It must follow, therefore, that the man who believes in the principle of politics is in a condition of servitude, whether he is willing or not to admit it.

The necessity of society, or the natural force of the desire for society, makes a perpetual confusion of human understanding. This in no sense justifies the employment of the will in defiance of natural law, and what may seem as a necessity for politics is of the same character as a necessity for society. Also, the reason why we can so readily see the faults of others, is because their surroundings are different.

Man develops by testing the power of his will against a perpetual temptation that the serving of others will promote the greatest degree of happiness; but the force of the will must demonstrate the reverse, or there is no such thing as progress. Hence, if we admit that progress, or a better state of things, is a fact, we must also admit that the principle of government is not necessarily dependent upon politics, or that society depends upon any specific form of society. That is, government could be a necessity without the intervening form of politics between the people and the government. Also, the fact that a system of politics has always been the ruling factor or government, is no reason that the people could not dictate the government direct.

There is no such thing as a popular government, unless the majority is recognized as the ruling element, and to obtain the will of the people, politics is more a prevention than an assistance. It would therefore appear

that politics will disappear in proportion to the individual indifference to political dictation. Political managers must excite the people or their power is sealed. But the love of honesty is always in the majority, or the human race will become extinct, and there can be no honesty in a system that depends upon oppression for its existence.

FALSE APPEARANCES.

The silent wisdom of the world would doubtless exceed in volume that which is literally expressed.

Literal efforts are reflections from the experience of the past but to determine the future, the analysis of literal expressions and a careful study of one's own experience is the method by which an ideal future may be imagined. But experience only reveals the present leaving the future an undiminished field and as vast as ever for the wheels of progress to plow their course.

Education, pure and simple is progress—growth—and but for this vast space that the future seems to embrace, education would be impossible. That is, without space force could not reveal its power.

The true essence of knowledge is experience, and conception more fully relates to the actual sense of things, but words at best are imagery, and meaningless, in the absence of an experience to compare them by.

Now there is nothing more important in conveying the expression of our thoughts than a thorough understanding of the words we use. Literal authority should protect words, from the natural greed of man to obtain a service from his fellows, for the value of words depends upon mutual understanding. A studied purpose seems to exist to make the picture of objects equal to the object itself. No form of experience has revealed, or cast

any reflections, that would make this continual effort of man a complete success. Progress, however, takes place, as force moves objects in the direction in which the least resistance is met, but motion and progress are established by reason of space exceeding in dimensions the volume of matter. We all possess a knowledge of motion, even if our ignorance of what force is, is always to remain the space by which knowledge can move.

Shadows will cast shadows indefinitely, hence the versions of literal reflections, are subject to a variety of interpretations according to the degree of experience, which is the real scale to measure them by. Thus it may be seen that social disorder is first a necessity, to reveal the means by which a better order may be established. Such is progress and education.

The word education defined, is learning, hence the utmost limit of teaching is to reveal the means, and nothing is more confounding than to treat methods of education as education itself. Information that depends upon a literal conveyance is not knowledge any more than a shadow is an object, and the disposition of man to retain the best for himself, has led to the teaching that information or shadows, were equal to knowledge, and good enough for all others but himself. Therefore, the dictionary claims that experience and information are both knowledge. Hence, when the word education is used, it is assumed to be immaterial whether the real is meant or its shadow. This principle of defining words runs through Webster's dictionary from the first page to the last, and the purpose is clearly exposed like all other frauds, by the continual effort to hide them. The motive is to justify human authority and support a division of humanity. It was doubtless conceived from the effort to justify chattel slavery, or property. Variety, and the love of being served, has doubtlessly tended to preserve this convenient

method of excuse, for a self-sacrifice would be the reward of exposing this bulwark by which lines of social progress could be advanced.

Thus we have literal authority contending for the protection of human bondage, while the force of liberty is seeking the channel of the least resistance. We must view this matter from the stand point of American independence and determine for ourselves whether shadows have ever successfully stopped the wheels of progress, or whether the creator is controlled by the creature. This brings us to the American form of government, by which the officials presume to be the servants of the people, and yet dispute it, by seeking to dictate to their creator—the people—a specific system of ethics to preserve the literal authority by which one man was justified in compelling another to serve him.

The proof that human bondage is not of divine origin is derived from the liberation of the slaves, and a more universal privilege of the common laborer to the fruits of his toil. That this greater privilege has developed a principle of government by which larger communities live in social peace, is proved by the growth of America. Progress may be like a boy chasing his shadow around a circle, but the desire of the human heart is to move forward, even if the man believes he has overtaken his shadow, when he discovers it behind him.

The learned of old, as a class, were either slave masters or seeking a method to justify the principle of human bondage. Now when we observe the fondness for literal display at the present time and also the fact that literal authority is derived from the very men who tried to justify human bondage, we must admit that the spirit of oppression controls the literally learned of the present day more than the desire to benefit their fellows. Therefore when the learned seek to justify slavery as a method of

civilization, we must observe the motive employed to compel the illiterate to serve the literate. Also, if the motive of teaching is pure the literal method of the slave master should be respectfully buried beside his whip.

There is another great reason why literal authority should be thoroughly revised. It has been demonstrated that a government derived from the popular will is a more progressive one than that which is derived from literal traditions. Now, if the people are recognized as the government the principle of an aristocracy built upon human bondage could not be recognized as having an authority over men by reason of their illiteracy, for the practical result is the same as chattel slavery, and a reproach to the first principle of American independence.

Roman politicians were far more honest in declaring that some were born to serve, and they made no disguise of their authority over the defenceless, but American politicians cry themselves hoarse in picturing the liberties of the people, and if their own example belies the rhetoric, they merely exclaim : "What are you going to do about it."

The right of defence is a right that is derived from the very force by which motion finds the path which offers the least resistance. Children cannot be taught and also deprived of their inherent right of defence.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE ?

There are people who exclaim against playing a game of cards. Such cards as have become immortal by reason of their pictures, Kings, Queens, Jacks, and mere spots to represent the common people. The game is to illustrate human life and will endure as long as strife, envy, love and hate are necessities to the activity of life. So many reasons are given why the game is injurious to the morals,

that it would be useless to combat them all. The two principal ones are: They lead to gambling, and the time consumed in such amusement could be better employed. Now, who does not gamble in some way or the other? Besides, what is really worse, who does not condemn every method of gambling except their own? The minister gambles with the congregation while the box is passed around, admonishing all who refuse to "chip in." The merchant gambles with his customers, the lawyer his clients. All take money without giving an equivalent; it is the game of trade, being nothing less than a method of gambling. It is the activity essential to life, for when gambling ceases, life ceases. The claim that one's time could be better employed would raise the question, what is better or more profitable employment? It is the privilege of every one to judge for himself. The matron will look over her spectacles with an expression of horror at whatever employment another may be engaged, while she might be busy with some article to give herself a cheerful appearance, besides declaring "it's no such thing." Girls and boys are taught that it is wicked to play a game of cards, with real high-low-jack cards, but they are educated to play the game of life, and girls work with slavish devotion to make themselves attractive and lovely. For what purpose? Simply to catch a Jack. Now, what is the difference in the two games.

THE MORAL LAW.

Aristocracy is dependent upon the enslaving of laborers, but regardless of appearances to the contrary, the laborers are happier than their masters. Why? Because the individual aristocrat cannot escape the absolute law by which happiness is obtained. It is immaterial how rich or polished in manners a man may be, his happiness will de-

pend upon the same law in common with the servant or the laborer—he must work. For in whatever method the necessities of life are obtained, happiness can only be had by the sweat of the brow, or an entire willingness to be responsible for the individual act.

MENTAL GROWTH.

The individual character of the mind is a fact that every person can determine. Man is not indebted for circumstances over which he has no control. That is, he does not make his surroundings, and while they are an influence, yet the growth of the mind is wholly dependent upon its individual character to overcome whatever obstructs it in the form of influences.

Mental freedom cannot be fettered if an unprejudiced view of this matter is considered. Its growth may be stopped in the same manner as one could stop the development of a bud by outside influence. The mature mind is sovereign with its surroundings, but because it cannot measure external influence beyond its growth, it is no reason that one should submit to a stronger influence and thereby stop their growth.

Man cannot suffer mentally for what he is unable to measure. The mind is therefore always able to act for the interest of the individual in proportion to the degree of intelligence it has obtained. The distinction between mental and physical suffering is a literal absurdity. Suffering is the sense of pain which is only possible by the faculty of the brain. Hence, different influences may be the cause of suffering ; it is only by the one sense of feeling that it can be felt, the same as different articles of sweetness depend upon the sense of taste.

The influence which obstructs the growth of the mind more than any other is that which is extended by a more

developed mind over one less developed. The self-interest which controls the faculty of the mind will always absorb more than what its influence imparts. It is only by a still stronger influence which one must defend himself against, that the weaker mind is able to grow at all. It is like the shadow of a flower casting its influence over a bud which depends upon the destruction of the developed flower.


THE VIRTUE OF IGNORANCE.

If ignorance is a crime it cannot be shown that the responsibility for a condition necessarily unknown can be attached to it. Ignorance is not an acquirement, it is as a priority to birth, which makes it all the more unjust for a man of knowledge to teach a spirit of obedience to the first flickering light that dawns upon the ignorant mind. The injustice of imposing upon ignorance a responsibility is exposed by the effort of knowledge, or men of knowledge,

to monopolize every avenue by which the ignorant becomes enlightened.

There is nothing more strikingly unjust than to encourage a method of ridicule toward the ignorant, and thereby cultivate an excessive conceit in one's self that is far inferior to the innocence of ignorance. Honesty must be acknowledged of the first importance and it is a feeble showing, the effort to justify a spirit of ridicule as a means to encourage greater effort in the seeking of knowledge. The responsibility of a dishonest act must rest with the man who wilfully commits the wrong, even if an apparent benefit was conferred upon another. It is quite common to despise ignorance and to parade what is mistaken for mere information derived from the vanity of man to rule.

That is, experience is very different from the literal information derived from the experience of another, and we



often charge the illiterate with being ignorant and even responsible for their condition.

There is a close affinity between the spirit of human bondage, and the disposition to be served by the teachers of literal information—abstract—knowledge. When self-interest predominates in the human heart man cannot practice what he preaches, and this should reveal to the sincere reformer his exact position. A sacrifice is not of the heart when the motive is to obtain a service from him who is ignorant and practically defenceless in the art of knowledge. Man can be trained to believe in natural depravity, and he can be sincere while his soul is absorbed in abstract knowledge, but we have evidence enough of the fallible character of the eminent men in all ages. The intellectual growth of man stops at the point where his self interest begins. No man can have faith in what he knows to be a fact and to believe it a fact establishes an infallible opinion of one's self that makes the "seeking of knowledge" fruitless. It makes no difference how eminent a man is, he stops intellectual growth just at the point where he begins to feel eminent. Of course the gaining of eminence by courting the popular favor is not such eminence as the silent consciousness of performing an honest act, with no expectation of greater reward.

We must all remember that our privilege to seek knowledge is derived from a condition of ignorance, and the virtue of such cannot possibly be sought. We can no more prefer a state of ignorance than to object to being born. Therefore our duty is only revealed in proportion to our knowledge, and the proclaiming by man of those he would compel to serve, to seek knowledge, betrays the self interest by reason of the service demanded. Now, the seeking of knowledge is not from any command, but from an innate desire of a self-revealing character. It is a usurpation of a natural phenomenon for any man to pre-

tend, to *compel* an ignorant person to seek knowledge and to justify this claim ignorance must be proclaimed to be a crime, and dependent upon the charity of men who enslave their kind, or demand a service for the privilege of being deceived.

There is evidence enough that a man must first know how before he can be successfully wicked, and the necessity of throwing off this bugbear of natural depravity and the disposition to crime charged to the inherent faculties is necessary before the star of freedom is clearly discerned. The man who would charge the criminal condition of society upon the defenceless ignorant, and fail to see the effort to obtain a service from the very man he condemns, betrays insincerity and his alliance with the oppressive class of society.

People can hold their personal opinion of the sincerity of mankind toward each other, but the mind is responsible to itself for every degree of freedom it exercises. It is only by a just comprehension of self-interest that the mind can possibly grow; therefore, because one man yields to the influence of another, he will also strive to induce others weaker than himself to yield to him, but is the sovereignty of the mind disturbed by reason of its inability to measure its surroundings?

It is a beautiful sentiment, that heralds a sacrificing spirit, but is a sacrifice for a person to influence another, and also adhere strictly to the necessary selfishness which the individual mind reveals to itself. It must be observed that the image of literal ethics is secondary to experience, and the mind is not in sound condition which elevates the imagery of thought above the experience. That is, literal imagery is always related to experience, and therefore can never be above it. This brings to mind the question: Is education practically mental growth derived from external influence, or from the sovereign freedom of the mind?

Man's responsibility determines his degree of freedom ; for just in proportion to a man's inability to overcome his influence, the responsibility rests with the influence. Every mind can determine its degree of freedom from responsibility. That is, in proportion to a just regard for the promptings of the brain, will the freedom of thought develop. The exercise of the mind in literal imagery is benefiting to the extent only that it reveals the sovereign character of the mind. The ethical influence of literal imagery really obstructs mind growth, until the reality of things is conceived by experience.

The only ethical assistance that one person can render to another is to convey an expression of their experience in the most simple terms, and show by example a respect for the ethics which experience dictates. To transmit literal imagery from one to another and call it education, is to deny the freedom of the mind and destroy the most wonderful feature of it. Intelligence has no more form than light or the sense of taste, and mind growth is the result of the commerce of ideas. This is dependent upon forms of expressions, words, which should be so simple that the difference between the imagery of the mind and real experience could be readily discovered.

It may be right for a person to protect any special knowledge they may discover, but the man cannot be sincere who would cling to forms of expression which make the commerce of ideas very difficult, and also pretend to assist his fellow-men.

THE INFLUENCE OF MONEY UPON THE PEOPLE.

A Republican government protects the right to possess money regardless of the character of the man. The wicked and good alike can possess money. It can therefore be seen that its influence is good or bad according to



the character of the man possessing it. Yet it is generally admitted that the power of money not only controls a government, but its power has that charm about it which is self-protecting. That is, the power of gold cannot be disturbed; it is so attractive that people will yield their reason, their sense of justice and all moral obligations for its possession. This of course arises from the idea that gold is the medium by which all wants may be gratified.

The method by which money may influence the ballot is immaterial while this passion for it exists. No voter could be injured, no government could be corrupted, by simply bribing voters while this passion for money so effectually controls the mind. The great trouble, therefore, with the influence of money is the desire for it; and while this fact is a cultivated taste, the government will be controlled by it. It is a mere blind to quarrel with the voter with such professions of devotion, for fear he will get a dollar without working for it. It is a sham and a pretence between two great parties, each striving for the mastery, and jealous of each other for fear the simple-minded man is more numerous in one than the other. It is not for the moral devotion to humanity, but rather an attempt to keep this delusion of money more prominent.

While the desire for money is encouraged by every extravagant display of its power, the mind of youth is thoroughly absorbed in ways and means for getting it. He imagines that happiness is only possible when money is obtained to buy it with. It is therefore in the inconsistency of cultivating this love of money that makes its legislative power so potent. It is the passion for money that gives rise to the sentiment that its power cannot be overcome. The voter who will vote for a dollar shows the value he places upon his self-respect, and proves the influence of money whether he is bribed, or the "bigger man" pays ten thousand dollars for his nomination.

An honest ballot, or a just appreciation of popular government, can never occur while the corrupting influence of gold is used to protect its own potency. It is the scheme of the "privileged class" to keep this desire uppermost in the minds of the people. It is the sharp wit of knowing how to do it. The "privileged class" of society buy their exclusiveness with money, and then tempt the deluded victim to spend it, when it returns again to the pockets of the rich for a "new deal." The only way to reform this corrupt state of things is to act independently, and follow no man's advice, for he will always charge more than it is worth.

CAN MORALITY BE TAUGHT?

There is no desire that appears to be more popular than to become educated. It is the desire to grow and analogous to getting money. But is not the desire to teach founded upon the same principle as the desire to learn? That is an ambition for self-elevation. Now, if this is carefully considered, the principle of teaching morality is a very doubtful question. The person who believes that children are born into the world in a condition of depravity will from the same standpoint believe in the necessity of moral teaching.

If the desire to teach and the desire to learn is derived from the same natural impulse, we have an equipoise of authority which confounds the principle. Man justifies his convictions from statistical records, but such records are quite often biased and very unreliable. It is, therefore, the only resource for the thinking man to satisfy his individual reason, upon which a personal responsibility forces him to depend. It is a serious question to consider in general, when one can observe the steady growth of wickedness among a class of people who have had the

greatest advantages bestowed upon them ; and if teachers of morality cannot restrain their desires of selfishness, such would be very doubtful authority to formulate moral conduct for others. If the individual must determine for himself between wrong and right, when both can be equally taught, it leaves the question of moral teaching resting upon the spirit of interference, which is the base of social intercourse.

The commerce in ideas and the commerce in merchandise have been companions in the march of civilization, and allowing the principle of teaching to promote the commerce of ideas, it is no justification for a particular school of morality. He is truly a bigot who holds his own convictions to be the standard for all minds, for it would produce a stagnation of mental activity. Besides, how can one man have a conception himself that he must teach a duty to others in his own likeness, when he would refuse to accept an idea at variance with his own.

Now, this confusion is more in consequence of the extravagant literal methods of conveying ideas, than any natural intent to interfere with the individual rights, and when a man will admit that free intercourse civilizes the race, the principle of teaching should be clear. There is no general authority for what constitutes morality, for what is right for one is wrong for another, and the dual principle of life is essential to activity. The very object of a government is to protect the natural rights of all, and when it is seen that the majority of humanity must be morally right to preserve the race from the folly of individual ideas, social order will improve. A popular government, in fact, can only be possible when intimidation and special class legislation become more unpopular.

It arises from a selfish greed to think that people require special training before they can be trusted with their natural rights. Class privileges would improve with a

more tolerant spirit toward humanity, and the privilege to learn would doubtless be greater as the belief in the moral right to rule being vested in the learned grew less. If it is right for the individual to vote, moral ethics is vested in the majority of humanity. For whatever degree literal knowledge may reach, it is artificial, and it can never overcome the natural without destroying the human race.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS.

It is quite safe to observe that this old hobby of a right to rule being specially vested in a particular man, is already an exploded idea. Constitutional forms of government are more than an experiment. They have demonstrated the rights of humanity, even if such rights are not fully secured. When the principle of popular government is more fully appreciated the real value of the ballot will be more fully understood, and the rights of man will be confined to the individual choice of taking what belongs to him, or electing himself to serve another.

The principle of slavery was the outcome of the divine right of kings, and it can readily be seen that the idea of property in man was just as reasonable as the assumed authority for one man to rule over another. The division of humanity into social classes was a natural growth of the idea that some are born to rule and others to serve. A system of aristocracy thus became fastened upon the minds of ruler and ruled alike. It is therefore not strange that an immediate change of sentiment could possibly occur.

The conceptions of man must from the nature of things precede his convictions, and every individual is brought face to face with the problem, whether he will be ruled by his conceptions or his convictions. Now these two words conception and conviction are intended to



be distinct, but one versed in the gabble of terms could confound them with each other. Conviction should be applied to an influence from without, while conception is an act of volition. It is or should be an admitted fact that no one is responsible for the general surroundings or injustice to the faculty of reason; no one can be responsible for an act without the alternative of choice existing also.

The man ruled by his convictions, is a distinct character from one who is ruled by conception. In a degree the former is a slave, while the latter is free. The right of choice cannot disturb this principle, for if a man chooses a conviction to govern his action, he admits his freedom in choosing to sacrifice it. If we consider the aristocracy of the ruling class it can be seen that it is more a conviction than a reality for regardless of an individual's opinion it is no assertion to say that the exclusive class or ruling class of society are more dependent than the masses. It is the assumed guardianship of one man over another that betrays the folly of the divine rights in kings. It may be a man's convictions, and honestly so, but history should teach every fair minded man that a dollar in one's pocket was better than a note from another man with a conviction of its value.

In the transfer of governments from kings to the people, it must naturally be in gradual stages to overcome the firm convictions of the patrons to kingly rule. No doubt many believe that a republican form of government gives to the people all the power it is proclaimed for them. But while a vestige of the principle of divine rights is permitted to control a government nothing but a compromise between aristocracy and popular suffrage is possible.

The struggle may yet be bitter between the aristocracy and popular government, but the very fruit of kingly rule cannot consistently be the ruling power of a popular

government. The ballot cannot be taken away, and upon this principle future governments are to be built. But while a class of any community assume that they confer the privileges of the ballot upon the masses, it practically destroys the principle of voting. The ruling privilege transferred from a king to a special class of society, would be the same kind of ruling so far as the people were concerned. Hence if the people have a right to vote, they have a right to control or remove the political barrier between themselves and a self appointed class who assume the control of politics.

It is doubtless an idea well founded that social classes are formed from the natural differences in mankind as well as cultivated differences, but when the government of a nation is considered, no specific class can enjoy a right to rule without clinging to the fragments of the divine rights in kings. The history of the ballot is immaterial. It may be traced back to the beginning of time, it is no more than a just right of expression, and if the infant babe has a right to utter a sound in defence of its feeble conceptions the same right applies to the ballot. The fears of the rich and the learned are groundless, if we consider the common assertion of a too general use of the ballot. In the first place, a distinctive difference should be considered between a social class and a ruling class. There is no reason why a social class should be credited with a right to rule, for if any special feature by which a class fraternizes gives them a power to rule, the divine rights of kings is a fact, and the principle of the ballot is a chimera.


History ratifies the companionship of liberty and civilization, and if a greater commercial advantage is the result of a recognized right of the people to vote, upon what does the principle of aristocracy rest? People can seek knowledge, money or popularity in a government that knows no hereditary right of kings. Then why will

learned men stifle their wisdom to satisfy their greed? The right of expression is the ballot, and the power to intimidate a voter or public expression is a privilege of the learned or the rich, but does not the recoil of such acts do the most damage to the actor.

It is no secret to the illiterate voter even, that political intrigue defrauds him of the force of his vote. He is not so responsible as the man who knows how to defraud him, and the illiterate man may possess knowledge of which the literate man is ignorant. Literal knowledge is no comparison to conceived knowledge, any more than a yard-stick is the cloth it measures. With chattel slavery disappearing from the entire earth, it is the merest pretence to talk about giving the masses an education to fit them for the ballot. Without the divine right in which kings boasted, how can an individual or class give a right to the masses? Besides, if it needs a political system to protect the rich in their legalized possessions, why need there be any concern about the welfare of the masses? Surely, it would not be reasonable to steal a natural right from a man, and then claim he should be grateful for receiving a little of it back as a gift.

Now, the fact about this matter is, the right to vote is the right to live, and the same right applies to education. These privileges are not given as a matter of conviction; they are taken as a matter of conception, and the methods employed by men who still have a feeling of guardianship over the masses, is in general more to retard their growth than assist it. If this is not a fact, why will two men equally learned in literal lore, quarrel over the question of what particular history shall be taught in the public schools?

It is well-known that a compromise was effected in the early days of the United States which resulted in a representative form of government. But the past results



have demonstrated that slavery was more dangerous than liberty, and while the laboring class is even now only in a less degree a slave, it would seem that a little more liberty would be safe. Liberty will not need to be given to the masses, for they will take it just as soon as the surroundings can be overcome. The form in which progress appears is a matter in which the wise men are never consulted, but the sense of reason shows plainly that a political method of balloting protects an aristocracy as the ruling power of a government. If this is right, the class could as well settle their disputes without appealing to the masses in the spirit of intimidation and cringing flattery to decide it for them. The people can vote a yes or no upon any measure our legislators dare to refer to them, and it would not take long to dispense with the political machine entirely. A form of balloting would be a simple matter by which an actual expression of a majority of the people could be obtained. This must occur before the full force of the ballot can be determined, and nothing is more obvious than that the people will have more liberty before they will take any less. Also, there is no reason why the ambition for learning, popularity, or the getting of money would be disturbed by a square acknowledgment of what is due to common humanity.

THE RIGHT OF OPINION.

The right of opinion is not a gift, but rather a conception. People are literally trained to forms of expression, but the relative character of words makes them mere imagery of ideas and opinions. It is never safe to conclude that the words uttered convey the intent of the speaker, yet it may be correctly discerned by a careful study of the various acts which necessarily accompany the expression of ideas.

Opinions are sacred, they cannot be enslaved, they are absolutely free. Now, this can be disputed in words as follows: The opinions are subject to an influence, and therefore not free. Well, the rebuttal of this must necessarily be expressed in words, merely related to the opinion which is only represented by such literal forms. Therefore, we must be careful not to expose our own conceit by assuming to possess an opinion ourselves and also parading an infallible judgment.

Yes, even in our quotations from the words of others, we apply a meaning which makes the version just as much the representative of our opinion as if we selected words to express them direct. What does this signify? Simply this: The opinion is free and so recognized by the conception of the mind, a self-revelation, but the expression of opinion being determined by some relative form, it can always be biased by a variety of circumstances. It amounts to this: People can disguise their opinion by their choice of expression, because the right of choice, or freedom of the will, is acknowledged by every person who holds the opinion that a punishment for doing wrong is possible. This betrayal doubtless arises from an experience derived from sensation. It can also be shown that motives are good in striving to warn others from a like experience.

The teacher cannot disguise a pretentious purpose when he betrays the spirit of greed and disposition to anger, when his pet opinion, expressed in words, is disputed. There is no philosophy more correct than the necessary misunderstanding to promote human activity. We must above all else admit the necessity of a difference in relative expressions, even if opinions are alike. It is from this effort to compare opinions that growth or education is inspired.

Greed has ever been the incentive to protect literal authority, or the worship of imagery and words. For the

devil even can quote scripture and apply it to his own defence. The relations of society are dependent upon mutual understanding before harmony or peace can exist. It can be seen, however, that a variety of forms are just as necessary to protect the sacred rights of the family, as that which is necessary to protect the progress of the human race.

When a writer dares to criticise the version of the Bible, it always excites the indignation of people who live by the toil of others. This betrays a motive which should be carefully considered. If the motive was pure in striving to protect a form of words—literal authority—the spirit of kindness would not change to that of anger, from a mere difference of opinion, or a different version of a literal expression. A kind spirit will not stop to consider a personal sacrifice, or anticipate a reward. Therefore, pure kindness will promote a considerate feeling toward an opposite opinion. On the other hand, an undisguised disposition to compel an obedience to a specific version of words, and also the display of malice, goes to show that personal interest is above the spirit of kindness, for a kind parent would not throw a child into the fire to prevent it from being drowned. If the act was prompted by kindness, it would suggest the reverse.

When people strive to find an excuse in some literal form to protect their personal desires, it is more evident that such are serving the devil more effectually than is possible by any other method. Yet we must remember that we are not judging a person by denouncing an evil act, for it is quite another affair to condemn an evil than to condemn a man for doing evil. That is, a man could respect his father and hate drunkenness, even if the opinions of the father and son were different, or even if the father was an habitual drunkard. This is, doubtless, an extreme illustration, but it is for the purpose of comparing

the right of opinion under contrary circumstances. Conditions or circumstances, over which the individual mind only can judge, often justifies an act. Surely, there could be no freedom or responsibility if it was otherwise. Also, the one fact that greed and vanity are promoted by the worship of the imagery of words, should be proof enough that the devil has entire control of literal forms. The spirit of the Bible condemns all forms of idolatry, yet people are persecuted, ridiculed and slandered, even in this advanced age, for a disrespect of truth, because of a difference of opinion in the literal version of what truth is.

OPPRESSION.

Nothing can be superior to the real, or above the right. It is therefore an assumed superiority for a person to teach morality, for it practically calls for a superiority over the real. If it is admitted that the work of God is superior to that of man the principle of teaching is inconsistent with such admission. If man is a teacher he is also master, and the inconsistency of pretending to benefit his fellow-men by oppressing them is obvious.

Look wherever you will, the principle of teaching is analogous to oppression. The teacher and oppressor are one. The object for obvious reasons is the same, it is for self-interest, and advantage is taken of the natural desire to seek knowledge for personal gain, also an excuse for this injustice must be framed. The diplomacy of the learned is more remarkable than their logic, for man's effort to teach what is right is constantly disclosing his deceit. The effort of man to establish a right or create a right in imitation of his creator simply reveals an effort of oppression.

It must be admitted that all teaching is not good, for

it is equally possible to teach both good and evil, and the fact of the learned being unable to agree upon what is good teaching shows that personal interest controls them more than any feeling of good will toward others. Surely the teacher may teach a virtue but it adds nothing to it, but if an experiment of selfishness is apparent, it is more readily embraced by a pupil than the virtue taught. It simply betrays to the scholar a method of deception and it is not strange that the assumed idea that social happiness is derived from the principle of teaching would be advocated by a teacher who would belie by example his own teaching. Education is derived from the desire to learn and not from the willingness of teachers to teach.


It is not only by an example of self-denial that a virtue can be taught, for it must be apparent to the thinking mind that a teacher who will demand a service for doing good betrays a selfish motive which destroys the intent of goodness even if what is taught is virtue itself. People are not voluntary teachers, they are trained for the purpose, and are as ignorant of the design of their superior, as the slave who is made an overseer and apparently a master over other slaves.

The sincerity of the individual teacher can be proved only to his own mind. It is the intent of an act which makes an individual responsible. Hence none but those who know they are oppressors, will take offence at the free expression of opinion, which is the very foundation of education. When people can understand the principle, that God-made men, are superior to the man-made men, the object for which natural depravity is proclaimed will also be apparent. It does not follow that education would not take place, in the absence of teaching, for teaching implies an authority to teach, while education is derived from the desire to seek knowledge, and liberty to learn independent guidance by the self-interests of others.

PUBLIC OPINION.

Nothing is more sought after than gold and public opinion; either will pass current in the modern community. It is very desirable to be respected and gain popularity; it is equivalent to wealth, and although some might ignore the means, all possess a craving for the end; or, if not, it is the individual privilege to proclaim it, and also explain by what process natural desires are satisfied. Various means are employed regardless of justice or common decency, for the all important thing is to be recognized and become popular. There may be a silent comfort in being conscious of strict integrity, yet the everlasting itch to tell everybody will bring grief and sorrow to one, while another will gain applause by the ready means of a policy, when integrity is wanting. There is a general public and a local public; the latter claims to voice the former, but in reality each is distinct. Selfishness, and the desire to get something without rendering an equivalent, is the creative power of the local system; it is proved by the fact that an adjoining community possessing a different form of organization will denounce unsparingly the assumed sincerity of the other, while both are equally presuming. Prevailing circumstances create their own popularity, and public opinion is no more a reality than that two heads possess the same brain. It is no more right than that some were born to idleness, while others are obliged to work or starve.

Public opinion is created by those who have no respect for the general welfare; being born from a selfish purpose, it is ignored by the very ones who create it. A few outspoken men rule the masses by proclaiming a sentiment, which, by reason of its high sounding qualities, is called public opinion. It is only the desires of a few persons, who, for their own benefit, try to control more than



belongs to them. It deceives the masses who will follow a leader in silence ; that being interpreted as an expression of consent. An individual complaint is scorned as well as an independent opinion, and a few bold leaders will control a whole community in proportion to their ability to chaff and deceive the people. These bold leaders assume moral habits and by a system of flattery and humbug, which, if care is taken to disguise, the deceiving of the people may be accomplished.

Strictly speaking, it is impossible to obtain a public expression of the people's opinions ; it is only a term used to deceive the real public whereby a few men can do the thinking for the whole public, and for that matter the talking also. Everyone's opinion is sacred by virtue of individual inspiration, and a personal privilege, which can never be destroyed by wit of man, yet to oppose the bold leaders is to be persecuted, and told that "public opinion" must be recognized.

It is claimed that the age of persecution is past, but human nature cannot be changed by the mere changing of a word, and so long as the greed of man exists, he will not stoop to other means than such as will accomplish his purpose the quickest. Hence, any method to prevent an expression of opinion however disguised, is persecution, pure and simple. Social ostracism and even base slanders are the resort to accomplish what in the past was performed openly ; that is, to hush beings to silence by such means as modern art prescribes, which is equally as effective as the old methods, and more easily excused.

A real public sentiment could only be determined by an actual expression of each individual, and the fact of the leaders claiming the right to voice such expression, trying to suppress individual opinion unbiased, proves their hypocrisy ; and it may well be hoped that by the more liberal diffusion of the means of obtaining knowledge such

iniquity will be thoroughly exposed. People complain of unfair treatment ; they grumble and growl that affairs are not managed as they should be ; it is because they are too timid to assert their independence, and by their own act set an example which would put to shame the idea that human beings were created without ability to think for themselves ; animals even of all kinds are superior to such a fallacy. If no men had ever lived, superior to such a sentiment, no progress would be possible, for whoever can control public opinion is always satisfied and will denounce every improvement, while professing an interest in the general welfare.

That timidity exists, only proves a difference in temperament and is no reason that such a person should be imposed upon by one more bold and sanguine, any more than it is right for one man to earn a living for another simply because he is willing to. It is misfortune enough for a man to be deficient in talents without using him for a convenience to promote the bluster of a man who is always scheming to obtain a living by such weak tools. All beings have an individual level, or a possible elevation which their own energy will raise them to ; and for a person to assert another above this level, to gain a profit for himself, causes all the mystery and confusion the earth is burdened with. Natural force is the only power that can give a man any permanent elevation, and the effort to get more will always result in obtaining less.

For a people or persons to sacrifice their independence is to yield their best interest for the benefit of others, who will manufacture and declare a sentiment "public opinion," for the purpose of persuading innocent victims it is better to give than receive. Besides, it may readily be discovered that such persons who advocate the helping of each other are simply appropriating a natural law for their special benefit. Until a general expression of opinion is

protected by government authority, the exact sentiment of the public is impossible. The fact that a few persons can create a sentiment diametrically opposite to an adjoining section proves that self-interest is at the foundation of such a condition. Newspapers and persons professing to voice the public opinion are in reality creating it, and are thus able to denounce an honest expression. It is often nothing more than an individual opinion expressed by some bold leader, who would denounce any opposing opinion. It arises from an effort at control, and breeds a system of power which tends to lessen rather than improve the happiness of mankind.

For an individual to encourage manly independence and an honest doubt in so much bluster about the opinions of others, is like exposing a thief, who would claim, if not interrupted, he could enjoy the fruits of other's toil without their knowledge of being robbed. Whoever allows himself to be the tool of public opinion is fastening the shackles of slavery upon his own limbs. It is just as much his right as to be independent, but shows he is too weak to rely upon himself, and that such weakness is caused by those benefited will not admit of doubt.

Weakness of all kinds is the result of accident or some deceptive device, and like depravity, it must first be created, when a profit may be gained by those who encourage it. The only real relief from such a state of affairs is self-reliance and individual independence. A coward has a reasonable excuse for hanging on to the opinions of others, but for a developed man to claim such nonsense always betrays the object, however stoutly denied.

The individual right is acknowledged in a Republican government, but the clinging superstitions of the past are adhered to for the purpose of power, and also forms an excuse for accepting a living from such as are willing, or compelled, to share the sweat of their brow. That human

rights are proclaimed, and exist on paper, by no means suggest that such are enjoyed; but does prove by the fact of such rights existing on paper, the people want them. They are trained to believe that such rights are impossible. Then why were they so elaborately written? Whom do they deceive? For what purpose are the people deceived by them? Our Constitution proclaims liberty of conscience and the right of individual opinion. Do the people enjoy those rights? No, they are preached almost to death about public opinion, which is created for the purpose of making the business profitable. What is the object of individual opinion, if public opinion is the only opinion that a man can be properly governed by? Every man can claim such right and avail himself of it, which no doubt some do; but what is the result? Social ostracism, the power of public opinion, which is created by one man, or at best only a few, the power that would drive a man beyond self-control, when his grief could be stifled and his wrongs buried from public observation. Besides, the power that is able to create public opinion, would destroy the very civilization it so freely appropriates.

History gives ample proof of these assertions, and also that progress is the result of individual sacrifice, for a man during his own lifetime seldom enjoys the fruit of his exertions. A man does not court martyrdom; he is forced by circumstances and the power of persecution. The effort put forth to crush his ambition and stifle his voice if he dares to be a man, with courage to express his honest opinion, will, from the very fact of his own honesty, expose to his view the duplicity of his persecutors. Nature forces a man to express himself as much so as she inflicts pain upon whoever defies her laws. It is bravado to defy public opinion for the purpose of possessing a monument crowned with a martyr's wreath. Man takes more pride in his self-respect, backed up by every natural throb in his

breast, than all the honors and glory that the public can shower upon him, either living or dead. He discovers that every success can only be obtained by natural means ; hence, he goes ahead and defies the consequences.

Any man who will try to dissuade another from pursuing what to him is an honest course, with no other reason than it is a defence of what the former claims to be public opinion, will always expose to that man at least his own dishonesty.

Whoever seeks to imitate others, hoping thus to elevate himself, will only receive flattery and expose his own weakness. It strengthens those who will despise the source, only encouraging the victim to strengthen his own self-love.

Thus the strong becomes stronger, and the weak weaker. The opinion of every person is as much their own as their mind, and to yield to the influence of what seems superior is to go through life upon borrowed capital, besides encouraging a system which thrives upon the simplicity of ignorance. Grandeur, greatness and power elects itself to popularity ; it feeds upon the masses as crows alight upon a corn-field.


Ambition is natural to all persons and healthy in proportion to their adhering to natural ways, but as soon as a person adopts the picture of things as superior to the real, they partake of intemperance, constantly seeking greater enjoyment by additional intoxication. The description of wind blowing, rain falling and snow flying, is not grandeur compared to observing the real fact. The mere picture or theory of life is like a drunkard, who might claim, and no doubt feel, during his intoxication, to be superior ; it would also appear to be a duty to encourage all the drunkards he could find. To thus abuse a natural privilege and endeavor to elevate art above nature, is to elect one's self to a punishment which would gradually destroy the intel-



lect, making the false appear superior to the true, and cultivating the rankest conceit. Such is human decay rather than real progress, and whoever enters the charming circle remains there; for, by their action, they appear to feel the progress of the world depended upon their sagacity, the same as a person would vainly feel that the wind depended upon his description before it could blow properly.

To claim popular opinion as an authority, or to determine in one's own mind that whatever is popular, so-called, is right, and therefore a justification of an act, is very delusive. It may be quite generally the personal dependence, but whatever act becomes stamped, "popular opinion," it will encourage a belief in such act, also a disposition to so act. Hence the importance of searching into the cause or by what method public opinion is created. If it was a fact no one would question its force, but being really nothing but a picture, its power to allure unsuspecting persons is as great as attractions behind a drinking bar. The fact of the picture, public opinion, being better disguised makes it all the more dangerous, and more difficult to avoid. The motive is as clear as day why a counterfeit popularity passing current possesses object enough to warrant the necessary effort; which proves that motive is individual greed. It is a natural law which compels all living creatures to prey upon each other; and the individual authority to dodge, which is also a natural law, is the strongest proof of the individual right to their liberty.

How is the present public opinion created, and how can it be destroyed? It would be easy to destroy if the masses understood thoroughly the means employed to create it. Selfishness is a form of self-preservation and whoever adopts a course will by the same rule endeavor to maintain it. The power of reason is the result of intelligence, but reason must be based upon a fact, not merely a book labeled "facts," but one actually existing, the proof



of which can only be obtained by individual experience, the only base of true reasoning. A fraud can never be perpetuated by any method however brilliant, for a change is constantly taking place and exposing the fallacy of what has passed before. The ability of designing men to appropriate the result of these changes gives them the power also to apply a system of reasoning, and herein lies the secret of men being able to deceive the general masses. The weakness of mankind, if it may be called such, has ever demonstrated a love for display, or the ever seeking of admiration. The wily savage being outwitted by the display of a trinket or bright color, is entrapped and made to serve a more witty mortal. Reason attempts to justify the act by possessing the power to perform it, yet reason is just as potent in showing that this power is opposed by the individual privilege to dodge, or avoid whatever they cannot overcome. The advance of ideas, or destruction of false teaching, can only be accomplished by such as have the courage to express their individual opinions, guided by a natural love for their fellow-men. That such men as profess to voice public opinion seem to prosper is as deceptive as the means taken to justify it, also in claiming the advance of civilization being due to their exertions is as foolish as it is groundless.

Nature accomplishes all the civilization that takes place, the art of man is as powerless to advance any cause as he is to overcome his own love of display. All the power that man possesses is derived from previous conditions, entirely beyond his control, and just in proportion to his following natural law, and abstaining from the intoxication of display, he will succeed in taking care of himself, also, by such means would he do his fellow-men the greatest good. Thus Nature would be less obstructed for she requires no assistance from man, be being cut loose, so to speak, and in proportion to his courage to

exercise his freedom will he continue to elevate his condition. The effort to go farther and assume the care of others, betrays his love of show, which is the creating power of popularity, and, but for this love, would there be any necessity for its existence? A popular expression is not courted or sought by a real student. He performs his work silently, allowing himself to be robbed with charity for the thief, who, for the purpose of display will proclaim the results as his own with a smile of self satisfaction. The applause of a few, seeking the same false glory, entitles a man to wear the counterfeit stamp of popular opinion. A few men decide these matters as much so as an election is declared, and the reason is, because men are trained to depend on others instead of themselves, when popular opinion would not exist for it could not be manufactured.

It is no question for dispute that man is imperfect for perfection and free action is impossible, by reason of perfection destroying the freedom. If man was perfect his existence would be as firmly established as the planets are, hence to be just right is practically impossible. Now the very best a man can do is to do as near right as his experience teaches him or to be as natural as possible. Nature being the base of perfection, so far as man has been able to experience, therefore the degree that man alienates from her constitutes his imperfection. It is really the "missing link," which one man is just as well informed about as another, thus all the duty imposed upon man is to make that link as short as possible and thereby enhance his own life and happiness, fitting him to perform better an act of charity towards those who have drifted away, burdened with too long a link.

This link also represents intemperance, which is nothing more than being alienated too far from nature. It is necessary to the life or activity of mankind, yet the fact

remains that happiness and peace is enhanced by the shortening of the link. The allurements of life are necessary for the purpose of maintaining life, or what is artificial, represents all the freedom man possesses; hence without some degree of freedom life would cease. Whoever becomes overcome by influence, desires, or entreaty, will become to a certain degree intoxicated, which is a condition that illuminates the imagination, and whether by greed for money, love of display, drinking rum, or eating, it will all produce intoxication, it will lengthen the link between nature and the free will of man.

That this condition of things is the cause of all the imposition between man and man there can be no reasonable doubt, it also strengthens the belief that the greatest amount of happiness can only be obtained by individual independence. Nature never instructs one to instruct another, for all creatures are intelligent that possess a knowledge of themselves or otherwise they are unconscious, and the fact of their individual consciousness being absolutely their own proves that nature's instructions cannot be conveyed one to another. Therefore whatever could be termed public opinion is a myth, at best it could only be public consent, for every man's opinion is as absolutely his own as his eyes are, and the ingenuity of man has not discovered even one man's opinion other than his own, hence much less is he able to obtain a public opinion, however ably he may proclaim it. It is a well known subterfuge to deceive the masses, or what is termed the common people, into submission. These innocent "common people" are just as ignorant as their would-be teachers, yet believing more, for they are naturally credulous and will readily believe it possible to obtain a public opinion.

Honest appreciation is not despised, but it so rarely happens to a man while living that it becomes as obscure

as the truth. There is an inborn instinct of human love toward each other, a love for society, and a corresponding depression and melancholy in the absence of such society; but that such a natural desire should become counterfeited for the purpose of gain and a life of idleness, causes a great portion of the unhappiness now existing. Loss of confidence is the principle cause of suicide, the abandonment of all self restraint and a reckless disregard for morality. Life is bright to youth but when middle age approaches he discovers that he has built up hopes on a counterfeit foundation. Experience teaches him the less he accepts of what is offered so freely the more prosperous he becomes. If he has vitality enough after he discovers the impositions practiced on him, nature is always ready to receive back the dishonored clay, and restore again to honor and usefulness such as possess reason enough to see out of their own eyes.

Individuality is despised by the power that can create a counterfeit public opinion, for, to maintain fraud it becomes necessary to keep the people as ignorant as possible of what their rights are; then they bestow their energy upon their very oppressors who look upon them as mere beasts of burden and become themselves intoxicated with their own importance. It is natural for one diseased to feel that others are sick also, and the same principle applies to health. It strengthens the claims for individual liberty. Besides, however much is claimed to the contrary, every reform that history records has sprung up from the individual, thus a claim is no more real than that water will run up hill without artificial force. Organized power has never demonstrated anything except claims and theories, and all that can be said of such power, is, that it will divide and that each division would contend against the other which would develop individual power. Thus the world becomes enlightened by natural law, which is the right of every creature to judge for himself.

THE PHENOMENA OF WONDERS.

It is a universal admission that wonders never cease. Man has ever shown a disposition of envy toward nature in his effort to overreach and domineer over her persistent laws. He is constantly drawing conclusions from imagination, yet nature seems undisturbed beyond the changing of form, and no authority has ever been proven to be more beneficial to man than a strict obedience to natural law.

The seeking of an object is the pleasure; the attainment of it is merely the evidence of success, and possesses no lasting gratification, for it simply inspires renewed effort in the search for greater wonders.

By far the greater portion of literature represents merely the track by which various successes have been obtained. An idea, however wonderful, becomes simple just as soon as something else is discovered to be better. Therefore, while truth and facts remain unchanged, men's fanciful minds build visions only to knock them down and rebuild them again.

Knowledge is the common property of the mind, which becoming excited by its own success and will, endeavors to convey its pictures to other minds. This desire is prominent in youth and age alike, and is manipulated for selfish purposes; it stimulates extravagance, and false assertions are readily believed, in proportion to the wit and cunning of him who formulates them.

The most visionary problem becomes the more exciting if no absolute result can be reached. Hence, whoever can present a theory in elegant words, is all the more effective if it can neither be proved or disproved. Such a man is listened to in proportion to his ability to flatter and win the confidence of his fellow-men, who are credulous in proportion to their being ignorant of the words and means taken to deceive them. A phantom attracts more atten-

tion than a simple fact, for the former can be sought for eternally. This kind of speculation becomes wonderful in proportion to the power of words to convey the pictures of the mind ; they have no foundation other than the fact of mysteries being mysterious.

Real knowledge is experience, the actual sensing of an element ; thus all book education is a mere formula, its only practical object being to stimulate the desire for experience. To believe that words and formulas are truths is the grossest myth, for they can be multiplied to the end of time, and the astonishing display that can be accomplished by them will dwarf the truth in exciting the minds of men for that which is wonderful. Educators adhere to this principle for the purpose of making their method so attractive that the real object is surrounded with a veil of wonder. The man who claims to be a benefactor by endeavoring to teach others, will always expose his insincerity by becoming offended with whoever doubts it.

The conceit in man is never more prominent than his pretended self-denial in instructing others to accept second-hand ideas as superior to their own. The principle of education is derived from the desire to learn ; a common instinct that cannot be taught, and all the influence that education has upon civilization is its general distribution by means of the liberty to obtain it. The educated man no sooner discovers the wonderful power of knowledge, than he tries to impress every one with his own importance, and his effort to teach others to follow him, or his instructions betrays the selfishness of human nature, which abides in man even after he becomes very learned. The good or evil in the heart of man is inherent and amply proved by his constant effort to compel others to serve him in proportion to his knowledge of the means. Hence, the only defence against the power of knowledge,

is the liberty to obtain it ; not such as is taught, but that which is learned by the hard knocks of experience.

Diplomas are granted freely to those who have become filled with mere formulas. They are like wheelbarrows, the value of which being of minor importance to the load they carry. The mere power to imitate a set form, supports a class system of society ; persons who possess proscribed methods and attractive manners are doubtless so ignorant as to believe they are educated. In either case he is perfectly wonderful. Reform can only occur by the persistent force of nature, which will not admit of man's building pyramids larger at the top than they are at the base. Man can only reform himself, and possibly by the example, benefit others. The commerce in reform is a pretence, the proof of which may be seen in the faultless attire of a reformer, or in the extreme exactness by which all articles of food are partaken of. Such extreme selfishness may be wonderful, but it is more wonderful to consider how a man can expect to reform a ragged laborer by such inconsistency.

Character, and it may be even obscure, is the real element of progress. This is never taught, although influence in the absence of intent is doubtless a natural method of instruction. Also, if the mind is developed by active study, it does not warrant any authority in directing, or endeavoring to bias the mind, which is always an obstruction, for nothing can be truer than the individual right of all to their natural faculties. No one can be taught to discover anything ; it is a natural desire, and the most uncultured man has often made discoveries of great benefit to mankind. Therefore, while education is necessary to develop the possibilities of man, it does not justify any man or association in using their own liberty to deprive others of theirs.

The greed of man causes him to monopolize every



discovery he makes, and knowledge enables him to do it more successfully, hence, when he discovers that the inspiration in man to seek knowledge is ever breaking through the crust of ignorance, the man of superior knowledge affects an air of wisdom, wins the confidence of others and pretends to train and teach them, which is merely an indirect method of destroying a too numerous people. But Nature crowds the earth with humanity who are inspired with the desire for liberty, which can only be obtained by personal effort. Thus as knowledge becomes more general the interference with those seeking it is correspondingly less.

IMITATIONS.

If we would give strict attention to our own ideas we could the better see ourselves as others see us, and would, no doubt, be more profitably employed than by hiding behind the screen of imitation with a feeling of justification because others acted likewise.

It is a curious fact, however, that the birth of a new idea, regardless of how old it may be in the minds of others, will always expose to the individual mind the foolish obstinacy by which one will cling to their power of imitation. It is human nature to feel flattered by being imitated, while the imitator is generally possessed with that weakness of mind as to believe that the external appearances are the evidences of character. This deception is better understood by the model, but the gratification of being followed will cause one to disguise their real character, and by a patronizing air of attention, the poor dupe also becomes a victim to the power of flattery. He tries to extract a little happiness by reciting the familiar phrases in the exact tone of his trainers. He is con-

quered by the firm belief that others are as dependent as himself.

No one can see beyond the power of his own vision, and thus the field of imagination beyond is accepted in proportion to the power one has to win the confidence of another. This may be observed readily by the more experienced person, and however painful it may be to see another imposed upon by a man pretending to be a guide, an interference, directly, will generally strengthen the attachment of a follower to the winsome leader. The fact that the great mass of humanity are followers is because they mutually accept that which requires the least exertion. It requires no effort to fall down or be carried through life by the exertion of others. The disposition to imitate others, therefore, is not justified, because so many choose to do it, or because the mind may be destroyed by the deceptive power of influence. It merely betrays weakness rather than strength of character.

Everyone, doubtless, who ever experienced a result from the weakest effort to act independent, realizes the foolish theory that because humanity must necessarily associate together they must also submit to whatever sugar-coated influence is bestowed upon them. The man who possesses the ability to choose good influence possesses intelligence enough to act without the influence. Also, if this was carefully considered by such as dare to think for themselves, they would see that all influence with intent and compulsory methods of teaching or training was founded upon deception, and entirely in control of the devil.

The simple excuse is, "others do it." Yes, others do it; and also the imitator will try to find some weaker vassal and thus pose with the dignity of a leader, yet, in reality, as lacking of independent convictions as statuary in a cornfield. The fact, however, remains, that character

is never established by a system of imitation. It is only possible by the individual venture to test one's own intellectual power. It is folly to exclaim, it is better to imitate a great magnate than to expose a feeble idea of one's own conception ; but, nevertheless, there is more virtue in the weakest act derived from an independent conception than all the imitation or imagination that the wit of man ever conceived.

The imitations in the world bear the same relation to civilization as the ciphers do the extension of numbers. For instance, to take the unit one away from its six followers instead of the procession representing a million there would be nothing remaining. Hence, there is more character to a unit than all the followers that can be hitched on behind. Besides, character will always recognize equality, which pertains more to the fearless, independent act, than the mere volume it may develop. It is the one feature in humanity that cannot be taught. It must be born to the individual mind, the possibility of which is dependent upon the courage to be honest and assert one's own convictions against successful imitators.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN GOOD AND EVIL.

Ballot reform is secondary to the injustice that is perpetrated upon the common people by those who elect themselves to exclusive privileges, by reason of the knowledge of how to do it. To claim a right to impose upon the defenceless people is an injustice that should be exposed by every sincere reformer, it should be the test of his sincerity. It is absurd for a limited number of people, by reason of superior knowledge, to pretend that the people's rights are in danger from bribery at the polls. The common people's rights have never been recognized

by the exclusive few. What possible danger can there be to rights that are not acknowledged, and practically do not exist? First, acknowledge those rights, gentlemen, to those who are ignorant of the deception, that none but educated people are capable of, and the matter of bribery will be settled without so much tomfoolery about ballot reform.

The very object of voting is to destroy the affected quality of a class of people who are determined to rule while they possess the power, regardless of right or wrong. A free government signifies a numerical majority of the whole people, it does not admit, in principle, of a superior class. Hence, for a class to assume the right to adopt a form of politics that practically controls the system of government, is to leave the common people unprotected. They being ignorant of it, will not excuse the wrong in men, who, if educated, cannot be ignorant of the injustice. This evil will surely be exposed or history is only noted for its lies. The people will take what belongs to them as soon as a simple knowledge of their wrongs becomes general. The exclusive class will be called to account for the method by which they could deceive a great nation and rule it as absolutely as if it had been styled a monarchy. To proclaim a right makes it no more a fact than the humbug that the majority of the people of the United States are the government. The recognized privilege of going through the form of voting is in the right direction, but this advance in civilization was not conferred upon the common people by any exclusive class, it was fought for by people who may be styled ignorant or illiterate, but they possessed the inspiration of liberty in common with all living creatures. Such is the spirit of progress, however oppressive the result may be.

All history shows plainly that oppression, injustice, and wickedness of every character is confined to the class


of people in possession of advanced knowledge. The reason is obvious, for no one can do evil without first possessing knowledge of how to do it. It is the unrestrained liberty to obtain knowledge that civilizes the people of the earth, for man grasps knowledge as greedily as he does money, the value of which is often equivalent to the power of knowledge.

Reason and consciousness of duty is what suggests to the mind of man what is right. Hence, if a man withholds his honest conviction to satisfy his greed and love of power, the more knowledge he possesses, the more unjust he can be toward his fellow men.

Good and evil are in constant strife, and so nearly balanced that the activity of life is possible. It is no secret that a perfect balance is inaction, and also a predominant element will effect the same result. Good always prevails over evil by the protecting favor of Nature, and evil is only possible by the desire in man to obtain knowledge, hence, the progress and civilization of mankind is not due to any desire of man to treat his fellow men unjustly.

Men grind each other from a natural desire to elevate and get glory for themselves, but a thief would not be justified in stealing the spectacles from a blind man, and, therefore, the only good the individual man can do another is to act his honest convictions in accord with the golden rule, thus becoming a possible example to encourage others.

The common people have always fought for their rights unaided. The right to vote is is but a compromise with their aristocratic rulers; it will some day expose the insincerity of the rich man's sympathy for the poor, whom he is dependent upon for his wealth. On the other hand Nature is the only friend of the poor man, for those educated are striving to protect their power by monopolizing



what is termed ethical training. Therefore, man can show no right, with reason, to use his power to teach or restrain the very source of his own greatness, which was the liberty to exist without being compelled to acknowledge a superior right in any other man.

STATE MANAGEMENT OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The State has no more right to enforce a particular school system, than a man employed upon a farm has to compel his employer to cultivate and plant according to his instructions. He may employ a powerful man, but reason only could determine the right, even if the greater physical power of the hired man enabled him to compel his employer to submit.

The evils and injustice of the present system of education are many, also intelligent people are familiar with the facts, but doubtless lack the courage to denounce the outrage upon what is termed a "free people."

A right is the truth, a natural eternal existence, and the only possible method to determine what an absolute right is, is by experience. If ducks swim, chickens should not be compelled to, and no man is better informed why it is so than the chickens and ducks. Force will overcome whatever weakness it encounters, but when man employs his own reason to influence or destroy the reason of another, the right is wanting, and known to be a fact by every human being who ever experienced an injustice from his fellow-men. Students who have never got outside the covers of books they have studied, have no more knowledge of right than a broom-stick, and if one does happen to get a little experience, he is so controlled by his training, that his pride and physical weakness prevents him from proclaiming his new discovery.

If the present management of the public schools cannot be managed by human reason against the power of wealth and the principle of exclusiveness in society, a civil war will be the result. It is just as inevitable as that water will run down hill. Whether the teaching in schools is secular or ecclesiastical, the object is exclusiveness. There would be no controversy in school matters if humane feelings prompted the action of man, and having these feelings it proves the justice of admitting an equal right of opportunity. This can only be secured when a government system will protect the people first, and look after the welfare of the system afterward. In fact, a system of government will be secured in proportion to its being governed by the people, rather than assuming to instruct them. To protect the equal opportunity of individual beings, is the office of a government, and its parental presumptions are always usurped. Nothing has been discovered that grows from the top downward; it is always from the base upward. Hence, the top should not dictate to its own source, for if the base is disturbed, the top has the greatest distance to tumble.

A class system of society, under special protection of a government, is inconsistent in the midst of a people who are learning every day by common sunlight that one man has the same right to be free as another has to instruct him of what his freedom consists. Aristocracy and freedom will not exist in peaceful embrace any more than fire and gun-powder. That special protection to the aristocratic class of society is the object of the State management of the school system makes it an injustice toward free institutions, and also discouraging to the civilizing element of society. One can only determine this fact by a practical experience, for all systems of oppression present their most attractive side to those whom they depend upon for support. Yes, people may, and doubtless will

have confidence in each other, but those who succeed in gaining their object, always discover it was due to the confidence they reposed in themselves. If successful people were honest, they would acknowledge this fact, but they discover their position to depend upon keeping the mass behind as followers, which is best disguised by pretending to help others up.

It matters not how cultivated the people may be, when a government becomes over-burdened with aristocracy, it will burst the same as a steam boiler when the outside pressure becomes weaker than the inside. Man may control education to the extent of that which can be taught, but man learns more than he is taught, and it is just this difference in education that civilizes mankind. That is to say, what man learns by his own experience, is all the progress he makes, for what was taught him must have been known before. Man cannot place any obstacles in the path of Nature that will be permanent; she will not be trained or educated by her dependencies. Nature holds the balance of power, and man's circle of importance is so small, that should an inhabitant from the planet Jupiter chance upon the earth, he would need a magnifying glass the size of the earth to discover the scratches that man has made. The bodily importance of man could not possibly be discovered by a resident of Jupiter, if such resident was as much greater than man as Jupiter exceeds the volume of the earth (1200 times.) This would make the resident of Jupiter 7000 feet high. His "Highness" would surely have to lie down before he could discover a train of cars that might have run against his foot and bruised it a little. The shattered cars would no doubt be a curiosity, about as great as a man's watching a small spider repair its broken web.

There is only one method by which the social relations of life can reach their highest order of usefulness;

that is by recognizing the right of defence to be equally as honorable as that of offence. There is no sign in the actions of Nature that suggests the principle of yielding to be superior to the equal right to struggle. All ethics are founded upon the rights of the exclusive class, and the effort being constantly made to control what shall be taught to the rising generation is strongly tinged with aristocracy. The fears this class of society express expose their insincerity, besides the wickedness attributed to people who do not possess the knowledge of how to be wicked, is more for the purpose of disguise for such as know all about it.

All people need at public expense is what the whole people are equally concerned in. That is a positive standard of language unafflicted with ethical influence. Thus a single understanding could be easily had, and a fair opportunity for ignorant people to understand how they are imposed upon by those who know better, and also know how to do it. The liberty to seek knowledge is what belongs to the people in common, rather than a manufactured right of those who possess knowledge, declaring to the more ignorant what they shall learn. For if Nature did not push them along they would not learn anything.

START RIGHT.

The fundamental principles of education are not considered by those who are striving to maintain some special institution, or particular order of things.

This fact makes it important for a sincere student to start right, or a correct conclusion will be impossible. It should therefore be observed that the primary principle of education is established in the senses, and a concise mean-

ing of the term sense is the inspiration of self-consciousness. It is the instinct of human nature to seek knowledge, and without the sense of desire, the child would never stand on its feet. We often hear it spoken of that a child must be taught to walk. Now, strictly speaking, no child was ever taught to walk, but the fact that a particular manner or step may be taught, makes it appear to be a necessity to instruct a child before it could walk. The probability is, that more children are injured by instructing them in walking, than by any other method of teaching. This effort to hasten the development of children, if viewed from one's own sense, must be known to retard it and actually hasten their destruction.

The principle of teaching is not only a commercial enterprise, but it also possesses the peculiarity of disguising its own motive. It is not strange, therefore, that the chronic hobby of all the inferior animals being provided for by a natural law, the "superior animals" are only such by reason of their knowing how to deceive each other. Man could not have possessed the power to get up himself without also possessing the power to push others down; and it is for the individual man himself to determine in whatever success he meets with, whether he was helped up by others more than he was pushed down.

A conscious intelligence, coupled with the desire to investigate, is the base of education. Advanced knowledge or experience betrays to man the ignorance behind him, and between the sympathy and greed of man must this rear flock contend. Man uses his power to teach others, because he has the power, the same as he will drive away or kill whatever stands in his way. To make it logical, an actual necessity must exist, and the power to teach is used to maintain a necessity by teaching it to be such. To accomplish this a theoretic principle is necessary to justify an appearance of good intentions.

The only possible method of establishing a system that cannot be overthrown is to build it up theoretically, upon a mythical base, when it cannot be torn down, because there is nothing to tear down. Hence, the superiority of man's intelligence over that of the lower animals, is a sense of imagination, or form of power by which he can deceive others; and also upon the discovery of this power of imagination, he endeavors to build up a mythical system, such as he knows by his own conceit will flatter others. Man throws a charm around this delusion so attractive that the young mind sees all the attractions without being able to discern the motive, which nothing but experience would reveal.

The inconsistency of pretending that man possesses an influence of a higher order than the nature of things, is exposed by the natural inclination of all persons to select the best for themselves. This propensity to robe a greater degree of knowledge with greater goodness is also exposed by the faultless attire and general disposition of man to increase his luxury of living in proportion to his power to persuade or compel others to serve him. Besides, to denounce all attempts of laborers to improve their condition, has the same object in view. The term power is used to justify the treatment of the ignorant by the cultivated man, but reason is called for when intelligence meets face to face, when the elaborate ethics that man establishes cannot overcome the simplest truth.

Natural order is so well balanced that a man dies just as soon as he pushes off from the shore in the imaginary boat he builds. Hence, we get no tangible record of the ocean he floats upon. It is, therefore, evident that the inherent principle of intelligence, which is but another name for instinct, will, with an equal opportunity, discover its own method of development without depending upon the man who is willing to instruct whoever will serve him.

The liberty to obtain knowledge is a common gift, for which no man is indebted by reason of his having no choice; and the hobby that education bestows liberty upon mankind does not meet with success because it did not start right.

THE MISSING LINK.

We have to be governed in our judgment by experience and what discoveries science has established.

The exact difference between nature and art is the "missing link," or what people are striving so eagerly to discover.

The mere guessing what will occur, or what progress will develop, is not establishing facts any more than chickens can peep before they are hatched. It may seem that the missing link grows shorter, but the relative difference always remains the same. It may be seen by considering the difference between the ages of father and son. For instance: When father is forty and the son twenty, the difference is one-half, but when the father is sixty and the son forty, the difference in their ages is only one-third, and so on to sixty and eighty, when it would be only one-quarter. This would seem to indicate that by a mathematical calculation it could be demonstrated that in time the son would become as old as his father.

Now, this illustration shows the missing link with its relative variation; for it will be seen that a missing fraction between the ages of father and son would always be wanting, while the difference would become so minute as to outdo a man's mind in comprehending it. Therefore, to apply this principle to humanity, it shows the difference between existence and perfection, and raises the question whether a man can ever reach a condition of conscious perfection. A knowledge of the missing link would cer-


tainly reveal perfection. Besides, in the absence of an object of search, life would become worthless, suggesting the idea of the imperfection of life, or an absolute impossibility of a condition of conscious perfection, as much so as a boy ever becoming as old as his father, or that a lie could get near enough to the truth to become the truth without ceasing to exist.

WORDS.

Words bear the same relation to reality, to the truth, to facts, as a statue bears to a man. They represent the art of man rather than the man himself. They are forms devised by man to convey an expression of thought, but they are never the thought. *

Everything that man performs, or builds, in a certain sense are words; they are the result of his mind or sense of his existence. The character of a man stands out by his works, and nothing more fully represents man's work than words, but the difference between the words of man and the actual existence of things is the same as that between the word sugar and the taste of it.

The problem of social life is correctly understood by the individual when he comprehends the sense value of words. They are used as a sign of danger, and also to attract the eye of a person, to entice him into danger. Thus only by one's own sense can a man determine whether a word expresses truth or falsehood, for the man is a living suicide who believes the words of others by reason of more confidence in their sense. If a man does not possess the sense to weigh and comprehend the words of others, he will always be a victim so far as he accepts the words beyond his measure of comprehension. The deceiver always uses the sweetest words, and afterward will sneer at his victim for being "ignorant."



One effort of man has always failed, regardless of the wonders that he has wrought; that is, to establish an authority that would enforce itself upon the minds of men what a proper standard of words was. It is just as impossible as to make a crowbar that will pry open a safe without the connivance of man—no less than perpetual motion, or to compete successfully with nature. This strife between the manufactured words of man and nature is the mysterious activity of life, and man can only account for it by his own individual common sense; beyond that he does not know what a dog thinks, but he knows the dog thinks because he can make it wag its tail, or exert the necessary influence that persuades the dog to do it.

Nature sets an example for man to follow, but when he endeavors to supercede her authority, by claiming any priority, he is in trouble. It is the effort of a boy to convince his father he should be grateful for having a son willing to be born. When the art of man overtakes nature, the man is dead.

THE BALLOT VS. MONEY

The individual and the ballot are identical; the person possessing the sense of his existence may express that sense by means of a ballot—a vote—the *ego* of man; the sound of his voice is a vote. It belongs to the individual because he has no knowledge of what to comprehend until he comprehends it. The birth of an idea is just as astonishing as being conscious of existence. In both cases the individual discovers that it was news only to himself.

The right to sell a vote for money is identical with the power to commit suicide, the one being as impossible to prevent as the other. At first thought one could claim that whatever belonged to a person he had a right to sell or dispose of as he chose; but an obligation to others is a




necessary principle to society. Also, the first principle of independence is non-interference with those who are not at fault for being dependent, yet possessing a right to existence by reason of existing.

It is, however, a fine point to determine exactly what constitutes interference. A man may vote for or against a measure according to his personal interest or prejudice ; it may injure another person, but if the other has the same privilege of self-protection—a natural right—the two forces are equally balanced and no injustice occurs. Now, when a vote is sold for money, both buyer and seller are thrown out of gear.

The direct use of money is called bribery, but the result is the same when used indirectly, for a legal right may be a moral wrong.

The only protection the individual has against the power of money is his vote, or vital force of muscle. It is not the value of money, but rather the ignorant conception of its value that disturbs the peaceful condition of life. The value of money is wholly the result of legislation, which is the mere creature of the vote. Now, a legislative body which holds its power by virtue of a supposed majority of the people, over-reaches that power. They resolve and tickle each other into a school of instruction. It fills their pockets with money, and instead of using it to bribe voters, who could therewith buy a barrel of flour for a hungry family, they do even worse. They control a system of training that teaches to the mind of youth, by inference, at least, that success in life is getting money, wearing fine clothes, and speaking so elegantly that common sense is put to blush for very shame. Thus people are cheated, trained and bribed by legislative bodies, who first make money valuable, and then train or develop the vanity in man so as to prevent the power of the vote from overthrowing this great injustice. It really



makes of a government a protection to the value of money, rather than what people vote for, to protect their equal right to existence, regardless of the power of money. Thus people who are in possession of this power have more influence, and the reason they are opposed to bribery is for fear poor men will get some money without working for it. Besides, it gives them airs, and makes too many of the great-I-ams.

There is no possible difference in training a person how to vote, or bribing him with money, unless it is in favor of money, for its power is weakened in proportion to general distribution. No one would burden his pockets with it but for the exclusive position it gave him. Therefore, it puts all the scholars and writers to their wits end to devise means of keeping wealth so confined that it will not become common, when it would be useless. To train a vote, or voter, is to guide either for a purpose that is hidden from the understanding of the average man who votes. This, in reality, destroys the object of voting, also the vote which is no less than the man himself.

Every man that is conscious of his existence knows what he wants when he is inspired with the desire. Because he can be worked over and trained into different shape by the power of others, is no more right than to knock a man down with a brick and claim a justification of the act, because a brick will fall from the top of a chimney and do the same thing.

Whatever a man is ignorant of has nothing to do with his vote, any more than his birth depends upon previous knowledge of the event. Besides, all men are ignorant of something, or fools. Also, if a man is illiterate he possesses the knowledge of his existence, no less than common sense. Hence, it is no reason why he should shut his mouth and be trained by others to elect himself a pauper and thus protect the power that gives value to

money, with no other reason than the power to do it. There is not a possible value to the earth except labor and sunshine, and regardless of the immense struggles of the mighty brain of man, no man can show a just right to any more than the product of his labor, even if his head is too weak to bear the sunshine.

If one thousand pennies were shaken up and spread out upon a table the chance would be equal for them to face "heads or tails." The greater the number the more probability there would be for them to balance, or face in equal halves. By this illustration it could be seen that the purity of the ballot would be much safer in the hands of illiterate, ignorant voters than when bribed by either training or money. It is a simple problem, for if a man has not been trained which way to vote he will be just as liable to vote right as wrong, and an ignorant man is always happier than when he is trained to serve those who claim the earth by the power of injustice.

All the questions of the day center upon this fraud, which a good many men are trying honestly to expose. The very first step in that direction must be this one: A man must first understand himself before he steps outside with even a presumed privilege to suggest a method of reform for another. Whatever little prejudice or evil he hugs to himself, spoils him for a practical reformer. He will shield others, who are in sympathy with his little pet evil, with all the talent he possesses. Such men scheme and tickle each other by comparing notes of their greatness. They manage to get food enough to continue the combustion of life, also some popularity, which they exchange with each other. Honesty or truth will stand out alone like a lone pine in a swamp. Such is a pure ballot, however ignorant, and all the acquired skill, backed up by science, theology or the power of money depends upon the human nature of man—common sense—a law superior to the art of man—an individual right—an honest ballot.

BALLOT REFORM.

The advanced condition of the present race brings more prominently before the people the many methods employed by those who enjoy wealth and power, to deceive the industrious people and protect so far as possible whatever systems custom has established.

The agitations from all quarters of the globe point toward a reform in methods of government. The signs are ominous that some great change will soon take place. The magnitude of wealth, the increase of poverty, and the consequent increase of taxation, which must always be laid upon the industrious people as the only means of supporting wealth and poverty, causes domestic discord, with a troublesome condition of society in general. All this points to a serious wrong, an inequality, a great injustice that every person should inquire into, even if powerless to effect a reform. It is certainly as much a right to resist an injustice as it is to be unjust, and the man who is afraid of stirring up strife, was either born feeble or stands self committed to the policy of crushing others for the purpose of elevating himself.

Political corruption increases with a higher order of cultivation, and from that source the rights of the people will never be recognized. The present system of education encourages the idea that plenty of money with no work is the only evidence of a successful man. This increases the oppression of the food-producing laborer, who also endeavors to educate his children that only such people who wear gloves, or perform genteel labor, are classed as respectable.

No method of taxation can be conceived of but what the food-producing laborer is the victim. In addition, he is stigmatized as being vicious, ignorant, devoted to crime, for no other reason than his being too poor to cover up

his wrong-doing as successfully as his more cultivated brother. Besides, every honest man knows that the industrious man has no time to be mean, or at least not so much time as the idle man, whether ignorant or wise.

The present system of education crowds the professions, and swells the ranks of idle indolence to dangerous proportions; while the laborer who tills the soil is thus compelled to share more of the fruits of that labor with those who are idle. The only encouragement held out to the food-producing laborer is to acquire book knowledge and educate his children so they may not have to toil like their parents in the much despised dirt.

These efforts all tend to increase the numbers of non-producers, the discontent of the laborer, and a greater assumption of those whom culture has elevated to treat common laborers with scorn and contempt.

The laborer, even, is no sooner raised from common toil than he discards his tools and imitates, so far as possible, those he had been taught from childhood were superior. He seeks genteel employment, and often what is worse, seeks to obtain a living without rendering any equivalent. If man with his freedom and power of reason, which gives him the power of being both just and unjust, is unable to establish a government to protect this power, and also an equal opportunity for all, whether rich or poor, Nature will show her power by overthrowing the system.

The power of organizations are used for the purpose of maintaining the existing custom; they seldom support any improvement until the people insist upon it, hence, any reforms from such quarters are futile. They want followers and adopt any measures to obtain them. Political parties are more for the purpose of deceiving the people than benefiting them. Such organizations depend upon their ability to deceive. An honest ballot, an actual expression of the majority of a people forming a nation, is

impossible by the medium of politics, the very object of which is to prevent an actual expression of the people, but to make them believe they enjoy what they are really deprived of.

The people know what they want, but when a leader is bold enough to lead them he becomes corrupt as soon as he meets any success. Laborers organize for the purpose of protection against wealth and capital (mere accumulated labor) only to be taxed and oppressed all the more by those who promise to lead them out of their troubles, which are caused more by reason of their submitting to being led than from any other cause.

This ceaseless war of strife goes on without reason or justice. The man who works the hardest gets a mere living, while he sees another grow rich without an effort. All kinds of remedies and all kinds of evils are offered for sale that the vender may first profit by causing the disease, and then reap another profit by curing it. The activity which life depends upon is simply made commerce of, to promote personal profit.

Human nature is a fixed fact and not at fault simply because man discovered himself and became conscious of his existence. He had no choice, knowledge was thrust upon him. He discovered he was free to abuse even his own freedom; this must be a fact, or he is not free and wholly irresponsible for his acts.

The only possibility of peaceable society is the redeeming quality in man—his reason. This should regulate his sense of justice toward his fellow-men, and also the fact that he had no right to be unjust toward others who have also had a nip of the "forbidden fruit" and just as much right to use their power in defence as another has to be unjust and oppressive by means of the same power.

Man's only source of knowledge that he can absolutely trust is his own experience; his "best friends" forsake

him just as quick as he really needs any friendship. This always proves the existence and right of individual liberty, and that all success in life depends upon the courage of a person to act his natural privilege.

Civilization has been marked by less obstruction to this "dreadful state of things" for fear peaceable society would be disturbed. But the man even now who would dare to express his honest opinions in opposition to his kindred, would sooner flee to the haunts of ignorance than to look for sympathy among those claiming themselves to be respectable by reason of their culture.

There is no danger from individual liberty; the danger to the peace of society is the effort to restrain this right for fear there will be too much freedom; but too much freedom is impossible when every living creature is fairly kicking with it, and using all they have for the purpose of obtaining more. Freedom is life itself.

It is often claimed that a Republican government confers more freedom upon its subjects than any other form. How can a government confer upon the people the same power it derives from the people? Does the son confer freedom upon the father, who should be grateful to the son for being willing to be born? The fact of the case is, the United States—a Republic so-called—was honestly established by the people, and then stolen by a political system, which has controlled it ever since. It is, therefore, amusing to listen to political orators when they assert: "We" (our party) will give you the freedom the other party would rob from you. Now the very fact that a government cannot confer freedom is the reason why it should not be controlled by any special institution known as a political machine. For the very object of a government is thus destroyed, that is, to protect the people against such abominable deception, the possibility of which being the very object of politics. Such parties will exist

just as long as ignorant people enough can be found to support them. A courageous individual expression from intelligent people who really know better, would destroy a political system of government, the very opposite of a true Republic.

LANGUAGE.


The simple definition of the word, language, is any method by which ideas or mind actions are conveyed from one individual creature to another. It does not, however, pertain wholly to sound or human life, for motion may be language, also all creatures that are conscious of their self-existence give evidence of an ability to communicate with each other. Man has never been able to prove that vegetable life is devoid of a method of communication. But the fact that man is constantly making new discoveries, proves that what man does not know is no reason whatever of its non-existence.

The guttural sound from the throat is the principal method of utterance. It is a natural effect of life, as much so as the whistling of the wind. It cannot be taught any more than a cat can be taught to bark. It existed before books, or any systems, that merely bear record of the result of language; and in no sense are books a means of product; their existence is a result as much as man is the result of natural order, it being wholly beyond his power to create himself, or to explain how, or from whence came his knowledge of himself.

All the confusion and strife in the world, even if necessary to life, for in order to be life it must depend upon something to consume, has been caused by the effort of man to thrust upon, or compel others to acknowledge his individual understanding of language. The man has

yet to appear who can prove his intuition of language is superior to another's, or that he has any authority to instruct another in whatever he possesses an equal knowledge of—a natural right to one's own common sense.

All the books that were ever written have never been able to teach or create a single sound. They have only succeeded in establishing a method of recording these sounds whereby language, the result of sound, may be conveyed from the sense of hearing to the sense of seeing. Hence, books are merely transmitters of both fact and fraud, having no effect whatever upon the truth, which always remains an existing fact in whatever form it is presented to the individual mind. The importance of books is not necessarily denounced by reason of their power of deception. They are like a lever which can accomplish more work with less force, yet they neither create good nor evil, both of which are natural conditions of man's free will. Good is such because it will always overcome evil. The reason for this statement is personal experience and the fact that Nature always holds the balance of power. Besides, if it was otherwise, it can readily be seen that the natural avarice of man, the means by which he is forced into activity, would destroy every living thing upon the earth. He can only destroy or change the form of things, but when he attempts to create anything by reason of his conceit, he merely destroys with greater rapidity, only to be overcome in turn by the innocent ignorance which nature protects by greater propagation. This principle would destroy the theory that ignorant people are naturally depraved. It reverses the order, for if an ignorant person possesses the disposition to do evil, it remains a latent power, until training and cultivation betray the self-knowledge of it. Therefore the system of culture is responsible for evil, while the develop-



ment of absolute goodness is only possible in proportion to a man's ignorance.

Intellect, or the power of understanding, cannot be taught, it is born as much as life, neither can its force be effected by any particular method or system of conveying language. It existed before education was possible, the force of which being powerless to increase the positive nature of language, in the sense that a pound of powder possesses no more force in consequence of the method by which it is ignited. Besides, to make this feature clearer, perhaps, sunlight existed before the individual man could possibly discover it; also natural language and conscious knowledge, the very inspiration of life, are far grander than what can possibly spring from them. Does the foundation of a chimney depend upon the gorgeous top? Does the sunshine cause a growth, or change of form, superior to its own glory? Can a man create himself? From these premises it can be seen that the conveying of an idea, the expression of individual thought, by means of language, simply ignites the silent power of another, which existed just as much before as after the individual mind becomes conscious of it. This all goes to show that the intelligence of man is not increased by reason of his ability to paint his own pictures, or that the picture is superior to the man, by reason of any particular knowledge employed in painting it.

We all know that a man has to be rolled after losing his breath in the water, but would that justify a man in applying the same method, by reason of the power to do it, in rolling another man before he went into the water; neither should chickens be compelled to go into the water because ducks do. Therefore if any man believes he has discovered himself it is no reason that he should try to convince others that his knowledge was superior, and that it was better to imitate his method than to develop one's

own. It would be the same thing for a man to expect greater benefit by submitting to another man's eating for him.

Through the medium of Nature, man is supplied with all the force he possesses any knowledge of, or to qualify this seeming assertion, man has no other means of determining what the knowledge of another is except by his own sense, or knowledge of himself.

The ability to convey mind pictures does not depend upon a method any more than other scientific discoveries. It is the truth that man is ever seeking, and it can never be shown to be such, merely by a noisy display of the method by which it is being sought.

Circumstances suggested the names of things, and action was discovered by illustration and comparison. The fact of one man discovering an unfailing law and being able to impart it to another, does not establish a right to enforce it upon another. The principle of mutual benefit is what guides the discoverer and whom it is imparted to. It is no more wonderful to discover anything than to be able to understand an explanation of it, thus the phenomenon of Nature is equally wonderful upon whichever side it turns.

Language is as natural as sound, also the transmission of thought action to one another is a natural method of human development. It hastens all progress, the possibility of which being retarded by the application of language to any particular system of ethics, or any established institution.

The necessity of a uniform system of language is obvious. It would enable people to understand with less confusion, but the difference in men's minds cannot be adjusted to each other any more than a particular diet will produce men of equal stature. A government should protect a measure of language as much as a peck measure

or pound weight. The length of a measure or the weight of a pound is immaterial, compared with its being standard length or weight. Public instruction should be absolutely confined to a standard language, and should be as free as spring water, instead of being as it now is a protection to a class system of society. It is, therefore, the effort of the wealthy to learn language so elaborate, with words of so many meanings that poor people cannot afford to measure their thoughts, which are no less pure by reason of their silence.

Nations progress in proportion to the protection of the natural liberty of man to exchange ideas. The liberty being far more important than the ideas exchanged. It also suggests that no restraint can be rightfully placed upon the expression of opinion. The pretence of an evil influence is for the purpose of keeping ignorant, or natural man so ignorant of his rights, that he will serve cheerfully his aristocratic brother, who has become so educated to the tricks of life, as to be able to get his living without earning it. It is the very influence of opposite minds that forces the race ahead, instead of allowing a normal state of peace, which is claimed by some to be desirable, because circumstances have placed them with no burdens to carry.

Whoever desires to express his opinion, however crude, or even "absurd" should be encouraged rather than smothered, for it can be no secret to a thinking man, that whoever possesses any degree of vitality, possess also some idea of duty.

That language, the very means of progress, should be so manipulated as to exclude such as have not acquired a particular style, is simply crushing a fellow-man for the purpose of protecting the few who possess a title to what is termed money; said title being granted by the same process of injustice and oppression. It is just as much robbery as for a starving man to steal food. Also the

power to perform an act does not justify the act any more than it would to take the life of a brother. Every individual must be conscious of his own mind action, and no two can possibly know that their thoughts are alike, hence the measure of sound resulting from mind action, may be considered to vary to some extent.

Desire prompted the discovery of a method of language which nature forces upon mankind; also the number of tongues or methods of language which can be exchanged for each other proves that instinct prompted no particular one, but instead, left it to the free will of man and surrounding circumstances. As all imperfections suggest the idea of growth, and that nothing but truth is an absolute fact, it shows the importance of a standard measure of language, so that ideas may be as honestly conveyed as human knowledge will permit. It should be one of the prime objects of a government to protect a measure of language, as much as a measure of corn. Such a standard for language would prevent a quibble of words, and also the fictitious elevation that extravagant words will maintain without adding any more sense to their meaning. Words cannot possess two meanings any more than the truth can be false. Besides the fact that words are not truths, shows the need of a government standard to insure justice to both scholars and taxpayers. The public schools should be protected in the interest of the whole people, and to that end would a standard measure of language tend. It is really all the people want, for beyond a uniform measure of language, it is believed by one individual at least, that man could reach a higher state of development by his individual effort. Therefore the public schools should not teach the children *what to think*, but simply an honest method to convey the expression of thought, and then give them all a fair chance to scratch for their own living. The present method of cultivating

the vanity of human nature is destroying more able-bodied children than rum shops are destroying men. How so? Because the fathers are driven to the solace of rum by the ingratitude of their children, and the extravagant ideas taught to children drive them also into rum shops. Nature protects those who are wise enough to see the deception of man in trying to teach that art is superior to her.

Greed, the mother of monopoly, has fastened its fangs on every conceivable thing, it endeavors to keep some of the race ignorant of their own powers, by simply calling them "ignorant," because they have not a particular style of knowledge. That a style should constitute culture, or be allowed to be so falsely decked out, is as absurd as to try and teach a black skin to be white. Is a man more intelligent because he becomes possessed of a fortune than when he was a "common clod?" He may appear so and be thus recognized by his kind; the same would be true of a mind that was taught that the imitation of the ideas of others was education.

Capacity or the possibility of man's mind has no more to do with the true knowledge than the same quality of contents is changed by emptying it from a keg into a barrel. Neither is a man entitled to more wealth and power because his pockets are larger and longer. But it does betray a cause for such imposition, for the man who discovers his own capacity endeavors to keep full by depriving the ignorant or weaker man of the strength he has no knowledge of. By this means, also, he is often able to possess a slave to serve him. Therefore the control of written language is important to the liberty of man, for by such means is the power of the few enabled to enslave and impose upon the masses. The excuse that an ignorant man does not know he is abused, unless some one is foolish enough to tell him, is the excuse of a thief.

Education is no doubt improving the world, but it is such as Nature is forcing upon the race to contend against any particular style which the freedom of man is ever concocting. The fact that greater progress occurs to a race in proportion to their courage to assert their liberty, proves that Nature is less obstructed.

Imitation is as natural to man as to monkeys, and whoever possesses the most attractive language can always command a hearing, also influence others to imitate them. Thus the greatest amount of effort is put forth, and systems are organized to encourage an extravagant style of language for the purpose of social exclusion from those who are really compelled to support it, and cannot afford the time necessary to acquire such absurdities.

This extravagance protects a system of aristocracy which condemns simple methods. It judges the worth of people by their ability to convey elaborate descriptions of new inventions, in terms foreign to the inventor. They claim the new invention to be the outcome of our "free institutions," and the effect of the public school system upon our noble youth. The real inventors of useful things have generally been pretty free from artificial acquirements, and would quite likely feel like lost sheep in any of the great halls of learning, and only seek them for the purpose of getting their inventions advertised in the fashionable style of language.

That the methods of language have anything to do with the elevation of mankind, is as absurd as to claim that a cart is improved by carrying a precious load.

All man wants is a method to express the picture of his mind without having to spend the greater portion of his life learning an elaborate system, which wears out the picture before he can acquire the means of expressing it. Such a man is more likely to be overcome by the surrounding temptations of high art and lose sight of his

natural desire. It is an open question whether language of any kind improves the actual sense of man's brain. It is a fact, however, that thousands of people are destroyed by crowding an elaborate style of language into their brain.

If "the people" are the government, it is for the people's benefit, and if it is the majority that constitutes "the people," the object is to protect the majority against the greater power that language and culture bestows upon the minority, for when the minority controls both the language and system of government, "we, the people," are imposed upon.

Individual effort has always been the means whereby greater progress has been bestowed upon a nation, and whatever system or organization seeks to suppress this effort should be restrained by the government authority. Any government system will cease as soon as the greed of man in striving to get on top of each other, over-balances the common, industrious people—the much despised laborers. Custom, the enemy of Progress, will always defend existing evils and also seek to crush individual effort, which is the only method of destroying the old customs, and also the natural method of life upon earth. It is the duty of government to protect the natural right of every person, when the government itself would be directed by the actual majority of the people.

The principle of measures makes a just method of exchange between man and man, and, as the length of a foot or the size of a peck can only be preserved by government authority, so also, should a measure of language be protected. Thus a simple measure could be quickly taught, and the exchange of mind product be as quickly conveyed as a yard of cloth or a peck of corn. There is no more reason why a man should be deprived of conveying his thoughts for the want of a language measure, than

that the farmer should be obliged to keep his corn for the want of a peck measure. Absolute rules or measures, depending upon disputed authority, with no power to enforce them, are only used to deceive such as are ignorant, or if trained, the mind is biased by disputed authority. No one would pretend even that the size of the peck measure was smaller because a farmer had whittled the edge of one to make it agreeable to his idea of what the size should be.

It is idle to pretend that a man must acquaint himself with all measures, and enter into a dispute with the different authorities before he can express a thought, without a sneer at his ignorance; while the man who sneered would be *willing* to even steal corn. But the "too sensitive" nature of man, which really means the sensible nature is very timid about conveying his thoughts, until, perhaps, he discovers by some mere accident that the water is not too deep to drown him. That is to say the confusion of language is maintained by people who desire to monopolize the idle way of getting a living.

It has always been the method of powerful systems, and established institutions to crush enterprise with rubbish words. They frighten the timid into the belief that their meaning was more terrible because of their inability to understand what they did mean.

A simple minded man deserves to be a hero (a mere genius is becoming too common), who possess the courage to break through the visionary crust and beholds the iniquity upon the other side, without being overcome by the temptation to sin also.

Yard measures are protected by a government standard for fear that those who never earned a yard of calico in their lives will be cheated. Now in order to protect the toil that produces the cloth, an honest government would establish a standard of language, which would enable

a common man to understand, at least, what pertained to his own welfare. The reason why governments do not prescribe a measure of language is because they have always been controlled by the few self-interested people against an honest majority; and the same people will always contend that no better reason can be given for its being so. If our ancestry had, at any particular time decided that the people on earth were good enough, the probability is the present incumbents would never have been called upon to improve it. The weakest reason in the world is to justify an act because it has always been done that way, or we had the power to do it,—the reason of a thief. It is for the interest of the oppressor of honest industry to preserve an elastic language which can be stretched to the extent of universal space. It admits of a constant preaching of elevation for the cure of all evils, when, however high a man gets the elevation is just as distant. It is simply the power of ambition, which is shown in a boy when he lengthens his legs with a pair of stilts in his eagerness to rise in the world. But the tumble of experience will teach a boy better how to get up in the world than any stilts the very best language ever constructed.

Ambition is but the necessary activity of our existence—life itself, but he who ever rises to a permanent height never builds a staging of other fellowmen to stand on.

A DEFENCE FOR THE PEOPLE.

The absolute must be squarely acknowledged before just conclusion could be reached. Therefore, in dealing with any problem, the natural and fixed conditions of material existence and eternal force must be admitted. They have, thus far, been beyond the power of man to comprehend or change, and what the future may reveal is

but a matter of speculation. Activity is an obvious necessity, the primary source of which is from the absolute force common to all creatures in such degree as the material form can sustain.

The principle of freedom is an assured fact, for the civilization of a race or nation, being due to a condition of government proves its necessity, from which circumstance the element of freedom in man is also acknowledged, for if man possessed no freedom except what was bestowed upon him, he would be so effectually governed that he would possess no power or desire to live in obedience to a social government. The principle of training is, therefore, a form of robbery, for it implies a service or obedience in proportion to the system keeping a man ignorant of his natural freedom. This will not admit of consistent dispute, for freedom implies responsibilities, and also admits the possibility of injustice and wrong doing, which must also be admitted or man would have no choice of action. The freedom of man, no less than the right of choice, is therefore, no myth, for otherwise fatalism destroys responsibility, and also the consistency of government in the absence of nothing to govern.

From these premises, gentlemen of the higher order of culture, may observe the fact that defence must be an acknowledged principle by every well ordered government, also that a class of people cannot be judged as not possessing an equal right of protection by reason of inferiority, ignorance, or silence. Natural freedom is just as sweet to a man, however ignorant or intelligent he may be, and the right of defence would be destroyed if the means were dictated by those against whom the defence was aimed. A wise general would never borrow ammunition from the enemy, but instead, fight the best he could with means at hand. The fear of stirring up strife, is but the expression of a coward.

If knowledge has no greater virtue than to supply to

man the means of deception, surely such men as become elevated by its wonderful power, are far inferior to the ignorance that is thereby made to serve them. The disposition in man to escape his own responsibility, or absolute meanness, by charging the wickedness of the world upon innocent ignorance, the very element of his own support, reveals the fact that he knows it to be deception, and also his pretended interest in education is more to teach obedience than to enlighten people in regard to a more powerful means of defence.

There is no element in man more uncertain or deceptive than silence. His degree of intelligence is unknown; he can associate and toil among his fellowmen unobserved; he can listen to those who proclaim superior qualities for themselves; he may also discern the real from the imitation; yet he must be dubbed ignorant, in the absence of a little noise, or from perhaps indisposition to parade himself. Surely noise is a common element that all have an equal claim to, and quality could not be assigned by man to an element he was unable to define. Therefore, knowledge, being no less such by reason of the man possessing it remaining silent, it follows that the little difference of a noise will elevate a man from a position of service to that of being served.

Numerous titles are applied to the people in possession of advanced knowledge, it would seem for the purpose of maintaining a pretended right to being served by others as much entitled to their freedom as if they also possessed the necessary knowledge to cheat and swindle. Such titles are immaterial to the fact that a group of human beings forming a nation, may be overcome by a few of their own number becoming learned in certain formulas. This system of education simply enables men to understand each other by reason of a mutual familiarity with the terms to express their thoughts. It goes without

saying that this scheme enables men to act united, and upon whatever questions of economy these awful terms are employed to ventilate, the propounders thereof never forget to unite against the "wickedness" of the illiterate people.

If human nature is developed by these heavy formulas, it is no less true that they are a convenience to deceive the people, who are not only stunned by them, but are also ignorant of their simplicity, and the fact that air is no more or less by reason of calling it aeriform fluid. It is perfectly clear that whatever development human nature attains, or whatever progress occurs to the race, it is not the voluntary intention to promote it, by those men who spend half their lives to learn a language for the sole purpose of protecting their exclusiveness.

Whatever height man reaches, his natural propensity to go ahead increases with the height, and only for fear of becoming lonesome, he would not look back at all, but push ahead of the band until he could no longer hear the music. It is a very important fact that, however high man gets, he carries his propensity to do evil with him. The fall he frequently makes proves that he could not maintain his grip; but it also proves if wickedness caused his fall, he must have had it with him. The fact that any man could reach the very top of fame without possessing purity enough to stay there, shows that the propensity in man to do wrong is not eradicated by the cultivation of extravagant language.

It can be readily explained, however, by the use of convenient terms that possess double meanings and for the purpose it would seem so to blend the false with the true that a successful defence against deception would be impossible.

The means of communication between the high and low classes are effectually cut off by means of the latter

not possessing a knowledge of the terms the former are able to establish. And if the high class are able to understand the simple terms of the low class, a convenient deafness prevents a successful conveyance. A simple test of goodness, regardless of class or degree of culture, is to be observed if it is self supporting, for the necessity of support betrays a weakness and lack of truth. It also shows that the exclusive class of society are dependent upon the means to deceive those who must first support themselves before they can serve others. The term society is misleading, and the numerous meanings applied to the word are for the purpose of justifying the deception of the exclusive class in being supported by the labor of others.

It would be difficult to draw the lines between the high and low of humanity, but the individual of both classes understand pretty generally where the line is. Now, the high class must be in the minority, in proportion to their height, and however roomy the top is, it cannot increase its population without a proportionally larger increase at the base, for this pyramid of humanity to stand upon. No one can dispute this general law, for whether it be in construction of a tower, or the elevation of humanity, the top is more dependent upon its base than the base is upon the top.

This circumstance should convey a hint, at least, that if ignorant people are willing to form the base for the pleasure of beholding the glory they support, it is no reason they should be deceived for fear they will refuse to carry the burden. It should be known by even a pretended scholar that no permanent elevation can be maintained, except upon honest principles, and no amount of intelligence can ever form an imaginary base for a fact to rest upon. Besides chimneys are never begun at the top.

Two pounds are heavier than one, and no one dis-

puts the law that greater power overcomes the lesser, but if the topmost branches of a tree are equally as dependent upon their source as the lower, and were they possessed with the power of reason, they would, if honest and sincere, respect the dirty roots their greatness depend upon. Also a just and consistent man, with the courage to think for himself, could form no other conclusion than that it was just as honorable to be the source as the result; even if the result was flowers with animate intelligence enough to flatter each other. Hence, it may be seen, that a right for flowers to teach their source, obedience is wanting, and what is termed natural depravity is so termed by man for the purpose of deceiving, or attempting to deceive, his own source.

The fact of its being possible for human beings to treat each other unjustly is the proof of individual freedom, and also the reason why degrees of elevation are possible for different classes of society according to circumstances. To protect an equal opportunity is more the office of a government than to protect any particular class by teaching the humbug that human beings were divided according to quality. Degrees is all that any class can justly claim, for when people are elevated according to quality, no deception or government protection will be needed. No one should be deceived by the pretence of any class in helping others up. The effort is entirely directed to keeping others down, for fear the top will tumble over. It is no secret, how people get up in the world; it is always by their own efforts. Yet it is easy to be deceived about this, for it depends upon experience against imaginary training. It can only be solved individually by such as possess the courage to cease following and act independent. It is easy enough. for a follower is always behind, and there is more satisfaction in the experience of a little real than all the imagination that poets ever sung.

Reason is the regulator of all social strife, which is as

essential to life as movement is to force. Life, with a proscribed privilege to act, would be as inconsistent as being conscious of one's own death. Now, the fact that the human family are the most prominent, explains the reason why they are more treacherous among themselves; simply because they know more; and if it was claimed that it would be better to cease teaching, if knowledge made people act worse, it could be answered, that mankind gain knowledge by the desire to learn. It merely discloses the conceit of a teacher, for him to assume the credit of bestowing knowledge upon another, who could no more refuse to accept it than he could refuse his birth. A gardener could as well claim that he made the flowers by pulling up the weeds around a plant, to admit the sunlight. The fact is man claims a deal more than he accomplishes, for he becomes so filled with desires, just as soon as he discovers his own power, that he would make every man on the earth serve him, if the spirit of defence was not a part of human nature.

Therefore, life depends upon the courage to defend it, and no man teaches another for the other's sake; it is always to gratify himself in defence of his life, in proportion to his joy of living. The treacherous acts of man in winning another's confidence only to betray it, is evidence enough that he should never be acknowledged a teacher of knowledge that every being is equally endowed with a desire for.

Sense is the most common and equally distributed element in the possession of man. He reasons according to his degree of knowledge, giving him the ability to make comparisons. Having this power, every one knows it to be individual, by reason of the sense of one's own acts. Man is never in need of training to know how to treat others, for his sense of desire will reveal to him how he would be treated. The reason why man does not observe

the ethics of his own senses, is the phenomena of activity necessary to life. Man has no means of knowing what wrong is by its being taught. He not only has a desire to taste, but he must take a bite of the apple of sin before he is qualified in the knowledge of what to avoid. After a man knows what is wrong, his development depends upon his free choice to take another bite, or let it alone. Hence, sense cannot be conveyed, and whatever language is employed to establish social relations, there is not a particle of sense in it, for words at the best, are but sense measures.

If reason possesses any merit whatever, it is for the mutual protection of human beings in their headlong flight to over-reach and outdo each other; it is the mere struggle for existence, the defence of life. Children betray this ambition as soon as they can walk, yet parents are so ignorant themselves they endeavor to teach their children how to behave. Its effect is to produce premature desire for display, and these efforts are a hindrance to development, unless the graveyard is the object to be developed.

This over-strained desire to teach children, is too much in the control of the exclusive class of society, which is determined more by the possession of money, than the particular degree of intelligence. It must be obvious to the sense and reason of a sincere reformer; and would he reform himself, he would either keep silent or speak his honest conviction, regardless of the power of money. This system of policy ingrafted into reform movements, is the real disguise by which false education is mistaken for the real, and children so trained, either die young, or mature as mere imitators. Such are apparently contented, if they can hang on to people of real culture, like parasites upon a useful animal.

Facts and fancies, truths and words, constitute the commerce of mankind. But the qualification of the truth

is always a lie, and the sense of truth should not be mistaken for words that are used to represent it, for words can be qualified so long as noise is a fact, or hieroglyphics can be formed. The ever-tempting of man to stumble, is to inspire energy in the seeking for the truth, and when he finds it, which his own sense only can determine, his success as a reality will depend upon his hanging on to it. Hence, the truth can be taught only in the form of words, which are never facts, any more than yard-sticks are the cloth they measure. Such as believe words to be the truth, and so trained, are doubtless satisfied, but they are as ignorant of their own powers as they were before they were born.

Ethical disputes are but the reflection of personal interests, and if scholars who are at heart sincere in their effort to assist fellowmen, would cultivate their courage and defy persecution, they would gain more glory than is possible from a system of policy. Men do not help each other by pulling them up, because the man at the top has nothing to hang on to. Hence, all the assistance one person can do another is to remove the rubbish surrounding him so he can see himself, when he will get up safely, and have no need to grasp an imaginary hook to hang on to.

INSANITY.

Any disease of the mind may be termed insanity; neither has the cause anything to do with the general action of a diseased mind. It is simply a condition of intoxication, having the same effect upon the mind whether it is caused by stimulating drink or excessive mental activity.


Common sense is the natural condition of the brain; hence it must always overbalance whatever knowledge the

mind absorbs. For whenever an excess of knowledge is stored beyond the normal capacity of the mind, common sense is outweighed and acquired knowledge predominates ; it may also be termed an excess of culture. Therefore, the mind is diseased in proportion to the excess of influence over the individual's natural knowledge—common sense. In proof of this, it may be cited that educated people are more inclined to insanity than natural humanity.

It is doubtful if any person can partake of knowledge as taught by others without becoming in a degree insane, for the ability of man to acquire knowledge depends upon his physical power to prevent his common sense being overcome by the influence of other minds.

A diseased mind would need to be repaired before a consciousness of the disease was possible ; hence, freedom from mental disease is not assured to the brain itself, and much less can it be determined by an observer, who must necessarily be governed by his own brain. Advance stages admit of scientific analysis, but the fact would remain that the secrets of the brain are only visible to itself.

The intervals of common sense in control of the brain determines a man's growth in healthy knowledge. This gives the recuperating faculty a chance, while to be under the control of outside influences entirely, a person is hopelessly insane, even if the action is so mild as to be easily controlled by the brain of another. Mere action, however, will not determine the degree of insanity, whether it is more in the observer or the observed, but one feature can always be determined by experience—that is, common sense in its natural state is the only means by which a successful result is reached. It naturally follows, therefore, that a person knows after a test of his own powers, to what extent he can exert his brain, and also the fallibility



of all theories that treat of one brain knowing more of another than it knows of itself.

Common sense cannot be taught, and it is no doubt evident to the man with the courage of his conviction, that it is what is taught or forced into the mind by a persuading influence that causes insanity. It is a predominating advantage of imaginary ideas over the real. The only possible relief for a diseased mind is cheerful society, and the only influence of any value is kindness, for the insane person in a hopeless condition is generally the victim of misplaced confidence.

NATURAL RIGHTS.

There is no greater proof of the natural liberty of man; than the fact that a government is necessary. Society is not a creature of man, it is a natural necessity by reason of being confined to one planet. Forms of society only are established by the power of man to defend, but the fact that whatever man establishes, can by the same rule be torn down, it follows that the authority of man can never become absolute. Society would be impossible by reason of this very freedom, if the good in man did not over balance the evil, hence a form of government is established, which will develop in like proportion to man's development and social power to restrain men from interfering with each other in that which is a natural right for all.

This same propensity to interfere pervades the government, the system of which merely reflects the existing character of man. Its power is not parental, but instead is reciprocal with its subjects, who are all individually possessed with the germ of government. A government merely represents a large body of humanity, and prospers

in proportion to its adhesion to the natural rights of man. It destroys itself, by the same principle that the individual does, in its eagerness to preserve itself, for man's power to build up is only possible when he may also tear down. A man spills over in his ideas of reform precisely the same as he will interfere with an industrious laborer to obtain more than he is justly paid for. The individual betrays his own convictions of liberty in not being willing to be interfered with in whatever ideas he possesses. Now a man not only betrays his inconsistency but conceit also, when he conceives an idea that he would benefit others from whom he would not listen to even a word in defence.

The presumption of a person, who insists upon improving another, merely betrays his own need of being reformed himself, for when a man reaches a degree of perfection, that enables him to be judge of his own acts, he can only prove his consistency by admitting the same right for another. If this "mind your own business" principle, was a practical success, no doubt the activity of life would be sluggish, but no man can justify his power of interference with another who is equally entitled to whatever position he is able to defend. No man can determine human duties beyond his own conception, and the best understanding always reveals the most charity for opposite ideas and the natural rights of others. One should always remember that established authority may be torn down by the same principle that establishes it, and the man who depends upon such, has more borrowed capital than he possesses of his own.

The man who possesses a greater degree of knowledge than another, can only determine it by self-judgment, for he would surely show a deficiency if he had never had the experience of being deceived by the judgment of another. This should bring to the mind of a sincere man, a disclosure of his weakness beyond the confines of his own

individuality. No man could consistently discover evil in another, without the ability of discerning his own, and until he could thoroughly reform himself, could he expect to succeed in reforming others.

The moral nature of man is an actual existing fact and has no dependence upon any established system of whatever man can merely form. The very activity of life depends upon the intercourse between good and evil, and the right of choice is essential for the freedom of man. Otherwise could man establish an authority over the natural morality in human nature, he would destroy the means of his own existence. But for the evil in man's nature, the smile of perfection upon the features of mankind, would be unobserved, by reason of existence being unconscious of itself. Therefore, one must readily see that without two elements to choose from, the freedom to choose would be a myth, and also the incentive to act, would be wanting in the absence of freedom, or to depend upon man's authority to determine how to act. Hence, training destroys the natural development, the same as the funds of a bank are prevented from developing the bank after being stolen from it.

A man may feel it to be his duty to interfere with others who are acting differently than he would choose to act himself, but unless he is prejudiced by disease, or possesses a wilful disposition to rob his fellowman he must admit that every man has the same right to choose his mode of action. To justify one's self by an established authority, is to be confined to the results of human faculties, and practically refuse a natural right to choose. It is also just as clear, that every person who is trained or taught, is deprived of their freedom in proportion to being governed by such teaching in matters of choice, in which the individual is responsible to his own conscience. No system of ethics can be consistent that pretends to teach

a man how to act without rendering him some relief from individual responsibility, when he so acts. Is this possible without depriving a man of his freedom?

There is no greater beauty in the action of natural law than that which rewards the individual so promptly for acting right, or punishes him so quickly for a wrong act. Yet it is a curious fact that the person too timid to depend upon his own right to choose, may be trained in all the established morality of the day and he will never develop a particle beyond the limit of his borrowed capital. It is the greatest truth in human affairs, that a being can never learn what a right act is, except by the experience of a wrong one, and without the two acts a choice or freedom of action would be impossible.

Nature is the progressive power of the earth, and the happiness of acting honestly is the apparent incentive by which mankind is persuaded to do the necessary work. Good prevails over evil by a balance of power, in the control of eternal existence; call this power of God, Nature, or whatever you may, it is surely no less than the truth, and the individual conscience will transmit more authority to humanity than all that man ever established. To depend upon others for instruction, is to refuse a natural right and privilege to develop, for ideas are a blank to the mind that hangs upon the instruction or established authority of others. A man may become a brilliant imitator, and do no real harm, except perhaps in his efforts to teach others to follow rather than to test their own faculties.

Because a man never experienced the birth of an idea himself, he naturally feels that others are mere borrowers also. Such a man is as ignorant of what others know, as he was himself before he was born.

Man does not suffer for the need of instruction, he suffers by reason of having had too much. A child may

be taught that the very sun was instructed how to convey its light and heat upon the earth, and because it could not be proved to the contrary, it is proclaimed that an assertion is a fact if it cannot be disproved. There are no instructions which man may receive more positive than such as is derived from his sense of existence—his consciousness. It may be thought desirable that to teach and train a fellow being to be obedient will improve society; but forms of society should never be mistaken for the general principle. Therefore, a man to submit cheerfully to a tax of half his toil to support those who insist upon teaching, is pure deception. The man who will deliberately do this for a mere livelihood, may by means of his pride and ignorance of the knowledge of others, think he can hide the burden of his conscience. Nature demands a strict account from the individual man, he cannot get rid of his pains and aches even if he can convince himself that nature was the most to blame.

Liberty and progress depend upon the individual courage to defend one's own honesty, and thereby preserves a natural right. This cannot be taught, for ideas must first be born, and were it possible to transmit experience, it would prevent the very development that the birth of an idea establishes. No man will use his own faculties to obtain food for brain or stomach if he can prevail upon or compel another to furnish it for him. It is, therefore, clear that the person who becomes trained to obey any established authority, or such as depends upon the power of man to defend, he is practically dead, for by such means his own faculties are dormant and will refuse to bring forth ideas of their own.

This principle exposes the deception in human nature, derived from the necessity of evil, in order to protect the individual privilege of doing right of his own free choice.


The person who hides a wrong act is compelled to

defend it by continuing to act wrong, until overpowering pride will fasten the fetters more securely. A pretence of sympathy for struggling humanity, is the very means by which one hopes to detract attention from their own depravity. It is, therefore, only from personal neglect that a person can spare the time to seek for evil in others. Besides the insincerity of a man is always exposed in proportion to his effort to point out the evil in others. There is no greater proof for this principle than the individual responsibility, a fact which makes it an imperative duty to choose for one's self between good and evil. Mankind is compelled to interfere with each other for we have only one planet to exist upon. Therefore, to exist individually we must recognize that others do also, and only by our own consciousness are we taught a duty to ourselves, which will also reveal our relation to society and the same respect for the ideas of others as we have for our own.

THE RIGHTS OF THE LABORER.

With proper consideration for the commerce or intercourse between man and man, the right of the laborer to the product of his toil is a right beyond reasonable dispute. But the laborer does not receive the fruit of his toil, and whatever may be the cause of this injustice, it is a weak excuse for a man who enjoys the fruits of others' toil to claim it to be right because it occurs, and also quotes history to prove that it has always been so. It needs no argument to prove the possibility of a wrong act, and the fact that a wrong will occur, the length of time it may continue will never make it right.

The only justification, worthy of notice in this inequality in the exchange of labor product, is the improved condition of society in proportion to the commer-



cial intercourse that takes place. Hence, the great question of life is between the laborer and ethical authority, and whatever man's necessities are, either morally or physically, he has in equity the right to the product of his labor in whatever sense one may consider it. What the real product is, or what constituted real labor, is a question that the laborer, of whatever character, should be equally entitled to consider. The interest of civilization could not be considered as resting upon an injustice to the laborer.

Commerce stimulates the love for work, and upon this exertion depends the growth of a race. Work may be classed as mental and manual, but work or labor has but one significance; it is the exertion from which some product is desired. The mind will work without any aid from the hands, but the reverse is not true, for the hands depend upon the brain. Therefore, in a strict sense, there is no manual labor, for by the action of the brain only can a person produce anything of commercial value. This controlling influence of the brain makes all the injustice in the exchange of the fruit of labor.

If the laborer who toils is ignorant of a method of measuring his product, he is at the mercy of those he would exchange with. The absolute right is to measure by the same rule, whether the goods are rendered or received. If the man who deals in knowledge and can render useful information claims the privilege to dictate the value of his own mind product, and also the product of the man too ignorant to understand its value, its equity would consist of needed information to make the value apparent. No other information would be of more use than the knowledge of defence by which a designing man of knowledge could readily deceive an ignorant laborer.

It is in the deception that people of advanced knowledge betray their injustice toward the common laborer.

They take advantage of his ignorance and compel him to work by depriving him of the very knowledge they pretend to give in exchange for necessary food. The ignorant man can discern that he is cheated, and shows himself a shrewd observer when he comments upon the idle consumers of what he knows to be derived from hard toil. If he could weigh evidence without prejudice, he would ask the question: Why are people who work their minds, and claim to have "superior intelligence" so broken down in health, when surrounded with plenty of food? Also, he could ask: If people who know what just measures are, do measure justly the product exchanged for ethical training, why does surplus product always belong to those only who possess the knowledge of measuring?

A dependence upon each other is a social necessity, but there is a line that Nature draws, and a knowledge that ignores just dealings with a man because he is ignorant of defence, cannot exist without betraying to the mind that possesses it, its own deception. Surely, man is not to blame for clinging close to his ignorance, when he discovers the dishonesty of those who claim superior knowledge. It is plain enough to those of advanced knowledge where the depravity lies, and who in their senses would admit the depravity of ignorance, when those possessed of the knowledge of measures were always careful to measure their own product by a larger measure than the product of those who were ignorant of the means of defence.

THE BUSINESS IS OVERDONE.

There is no doubt that wrong-doing is pretty well fastened upon humanity, but is it not the necessary reverse of right-doing? How could the spirit of freedom, that every person must feel, take place, if no choice between right and wrong was possible? It would not be possible to choose if it was impossible to do wrong, either

by reason of all actions being right or from a strict education to act exactly right. Who could develop and feel a pride of independence if the governing source of action was derived from the present over-done system of education?

The person who is sincere and would act strictly from a sense of duty, can best determine what his duty is. We will, therefore, consider this question of duty from the individual position of determining for one's self what their duty is. If a person is educated to the idea that it is their duty to educate others, by reason of a sense of satisfaction that their ideas are superior, such a person must necessarily see their own position. If merchants could first teach their customers a sense of duty, in just the kind of goods to be bought, such an advantage would soon destroy the principle of commerce entirely. Hence, when a person feels it to be a duty to interfere with the acts of another, it would be well, perhaps, to weigh this matter in a purely unselfish balance.

An established ethical principle may influence the action, but it will have no weight whatever upon the individual conscience, for that is the only absolute source to determine right and wrong. It is as absolute as the sense of vision to determine light from darkness. Ethical principles are established upon the experience, and whereas the motives are not necessarily bad, it must be admitted that whatever man establishes, the element of policy enters into it very largely. Therefore, it is a matter the individual can take home to his own conscience, whether a motive of self-interest is in any way influencing their act of interference toward another. No advice can be accepted in this communion with one's self.

There is no question but what education and training will influence the actions of beings who inherit what is termed a free will, but the individual can determine if the

sense of feeling has undergone any change, in consequence of a greater volume of knowledge being absorbed in the brain. If the sense of feeling is the same, the doing wrong will be as quickly transmitted to the brain, after becoming educated as before. It follows, therefore, that the teaching of duty is as impossible as to teach the brain a different feeling to the touch of fire. After a person determines the authority of their own conscience, nothing is more simple than to settle its individual character.

Now, when a person feels it to be a duty to interfere with another who seems to be going wrong, the result of such action is not transmitted to the conscience until the act is performed; that is, the sense of feeling does not anticipate any effect, the reason can only determine the probability. The fact that motives can be disguised would aid one in settling a debate in their own mind, for if a person can disguise their own motive, they should also reciprocate in reason with another, who may successfully hide the motive for an act.

In the observance of an act, of which an interference would seem to be admissible, the motive should be a subject of reciprocal reasoning, as much so as the right of defence against an interference, even after a person decides they have a right to interfere, it would betray insincerity and weaken the force of a well-disposed act, to insist upon the same conclusion from the person supposed to need a restraining hand. A just reasoner will therefore observe the golden rule and acknowledge the same right in another to justify their act as they take to determine the right to use their power in restraining such a one. Also, any one can see the weak excuse for a hidden motive, in justifying an act of interference from what is termed a public sentiment. A person feeling himself to be prominent can never reach a position in equity by taking the privilege to determine the public sentiment as but a reflection of his own.

Respectable people are honest people—those who possess a sense of duty to their own conscience and a charitable disposition of opinion, from which principle the commerce of life depends as much as motion does upon space to move in. Ideal perfection that imagination may conceive, would, if it could be accomplished, destroy the very sense of things. It is therefore clear that the consciousness of doing right is the authority for the act, but to depend upon acting, from a system of training, would simply be repeating the custom of things. Also, the liability to act wrong, is derived from the courage to act independently, for to determine a progressive act, one can only know after acting whether it is right or wrong.

Character is therefore developed by the courage to act conscientiously, and the evidence of the business in reforms being overdone, is the disposition in man to drive a sharp bargain. That is to say, when a reformer not only pretends to be able to direct the actions of others, but also dictates the amount of money or popularity he is to receive for the advice, it is clear that his good-will toward others is a mere trifle compared with the regard he has for himself.

THE SINGLE TAX AGITATION.

Discussions of any character will develop the intellect and improve the social condition of common humanity. An honest opinion should be fearlessly expressed and it is equally an individual privilege to select the form of language most convenient for such expression. Men, whose judgment is often the best, are deterred from expressing their opinion from a too sensitive feeling about forms of expression. This is known to be a bugbear by the best educated people, for particular forms of language

for exclusive purposes, and reflect a motive of the proof of which can be observed when a man refuse to listen to an argument because the position is not in accordance with their own views. It is really to detract attention and awe the man's passions into silence. It is really the ideas of the few, and the people who depend upon an artificial method of language, to maintain their exclusiveness. They devote their whole time to so confounding the common interests of humanity may be sacrificed to their own advantage. The education most necessary is a method of language by which means a mutual understanding would be possible.

The essence of narrow-mindedness is when a man has a method of reform, and shows no tolerance of opinion, for from differences only a unity is humanity possible. Now the motive of the movement is doubtless good and we are not to find any method that will benefit the world. It is an easy matter to pretend to be tolerant when the real object is political. Men who wish to obtain followers will often

seems to us to be a superficial principle. It specifies a land tax which is a principle of taxation. In equity a tax should be levied upon land in its primitive state. Why? In the first place it is the only tax that can be obtained, and the only one that is called a single tax movement. He covets land that the action makes valuable. It is, however, but a dependent upon labor and when an acre of land valued at more than to write the amount.

Respectable people are honest people—those who possess a sense of duty to their own conscience and a charitable disposition of opinion, from which principle the commerce of life depends as much as motion does upon space to move in. Ideal perfection that imagination may conceive, would, if it could be accomplished, destroy the very sense of things. It is therefore clear that the consciousness of doing right is the authority for the act, but to depend upon acting, from a system of training, would simply be repeating the custom of things. Also, the liability to act wrong, is derived from the courage to act independently, for to determine a progressive act, one can only know after acting whether it is right or wrong.

Character is therefore developed by the courage to act conscientiously, and the evidence of the business in reforms being overdone, is the disposition in man to drive a sharp bargain. That is to say, when a reformer not only pretends to be able to direct the actions of others, but also dictates the amount of money or popularity he is to receive for the advice, it is clear that his good-will toward others is a mere trifle compared with the regard he has for himself.


THE SINGLE TAX AGITATION.

Discussions of any character will develop the intellect and improve the social condition of common humanity. An honest opinion should be fearlessly expressed and it is equally an individual privilege to select the form of language most convenient for such expression. Men, whose judgment is often the best, are deterred from expressing their opinion from a too sensitive feeling about forms of expression. This is known to be a bugbear by the best educated people, for particular forms of language

are adopted for exclusive purposes, and reflect a motive of deception, the proof of which can be observed when a person will refuse to listen to an argument because the form of expression is not in accordance with their own conceit. It is really to detract attention and awe the man of crude expressions into silence. It is really the ideas that are feared, and the people who depend upon an extravagant form of language, to maintain their exclusiveness, will devote their whole time to so confounding language, that the common interests of humanity may be monopolized to their own advantage. The education most needed is a simple method of language by which means a more universal understanding would be possible.

The best evidence of narrow-mindedness is when a man exhibits his own method of reform, and shows no charity for an opposite opinion, for from differences only is the commerce of humanity possible. Now the motive in the single tax movement is doubtless good and we are in hearty sympathy with any method that will benefit the laboring public. But it is an easy matter to pretend to be in sympathy with laborers when the real object is political policy; and the eagerness to obtain followers will often influence the reformer.

The single tax theory seems to us to be a superficial idea, while at the same time it specifies a land tax which is even now the ground principle of taxation. In equity toward labor, any tax whatever upon land in its primitive state would be an injustice. Why? In the first place it is from labor only that a tax can be obtained, and the mere applying it to land and calling it a single tax misleads the average laborer. He covets land that the action of commerce makes valuable. It is, however, but a prospective value wholly dependent upon labor, and when the single tax is applied to an acre of land valued at \$1000, it is of no more value than to write the amount



upon paper. The injustice of applying a tax exclusively upon land, may be seen in a variety of ways. If the product of labor exists in excess of immediate needs the result is capital. But land in its primitive state is not capital in this sense, for real capital is the result of labor only. The man who labors in excess of his own needs and voluntary dependence, adds to capital in proportion to his being taxed for this surplus. If he is persuaded to part with it in the purchase of goods, it is no less a tax upon his labor, than if he paid it for the general welfare. It is the fact that he performed more work than his own needs demanded that makes him a taxpayer. The man who will not work, or scarcely be induced to work his own jaws, cannot pay a tax, it makes no difference how much land he owns.

It would, therefore, be an injustice, to anticipate the value of a man's labor because he was willing to work, for only from the prospect of labor product, either from the culture of land or its commercial situation could it be valuable. This land tax would, therefore, drive every small farmer from his land before he put the seed in it. Farming would become a business of profit only to those possessing capital. Why? Because small farmers who depend upon their own labor, could not compete with an adjoining farm operated by unlimited capital. The small farm would, by the working of a single tax, pay the same per acre as the large farm. No small farmer could compete with machinery and plenty of capital, hence he would become a tenant of the capitalist from sheer necessity.

While this single tax theory seems to relieve the laborer by exempting the product of labor—capital—it would react against them from the monopolizing influence that capital would enjoy; for however much it is shown to the contrary the power of capital will always force the tax upon the prospective products of labor. It would

practically put the entire tax upon the man who was willing or obliged to work, while the man who took advantage of the tax upon land by selling it and filled his store-house with the necessities of life, would be exempt from work and taxes both. No, gentlemen of the single tax, your scheme is only beautiful in theory, for you cannot obtain any tax except upon labor, and it would be much more just to obtain it all from the surplus product of labor—capital, than to tax the man who owned a poor farm and could barely get a living by working hard. No man should be taxed at all who was willing to earn his own living; at least while men by sharp practice could get possession of the accumulated product of labor, and enjoy an idle life exempt from the tax that the protection of society demands.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

The sincerity of a reformer is put to a severe test when he advocates a restriction of the ballot, or would justify the regulation of the right of suffrage. Men who assume a superior height for themselves, can only maintain their position by restricting the free expression of opinion.

In the discussion of political problems, it is a significant fact, that the expounders, both pro and con, are agreed upon the necessity of keeping the majority of humanity in a subordinate condition. It is obvious that all factions, of what are termed the upper class of society, are merely striving for leadership, rather than a genuine sympathy for the oppressed people.

The sincerity of a man is only proved by the degree of sacrifice he will make in his personal desires. A mere pretence of sacrifice will not answer, neither can it be disguised from a keen observer. It must be genuine, for there is nothing more simple than to expose a sham

reformer. It is, however, a very different task to convince a body of humanity, of the corruption of a leader, when such a body are specially trained to resist such endeavors. The man who will clothe his person with attractive raiment, and gorge his stomach with selected food, is an imposter if he poses as a reformer. A real sacrifice is not that of necessity, it is only when the desires are at hand, that the strength of character is fully tested.

The temptation to partake of popular glory is a position that will try the strength of the strongest character, and great reformers are not noted for their attention to personal appearance.

These facts will account in a measure for the oppression of the masses of humanity. A class distinction is as important to one faction of ethical teachers as another, and this very adhesion to class difference, stamps the insincerity of both factions of political reformers, also all schools of ethical and scientific reforms. The man who does not possess the strength of character to reform himself and resist the temptation of popularity, cannot perform the more difficult task of reforming others.

It is the insincerity of polished leaders, that confounds the very base principle of social harmony and human justice. Power is confounded with right, and legal authority with moral authority, and no fact stands out with more boldness, than when the power of man is employed to persecute or restrain his kind from an honest expression of opinion; such facts stamp the man, institution, or society, as an imposition. They admit it in every act of persecution or interference, which deprives others of the same power which they claim an exclusive right to use.

An honest ballot, and the honest expression of opinion are identical, but men who have discovered themselves possessed with the power of leadership, have become so infatuated with the position, that they assume an owner-

ship of the dependent masses. An honest ballot or an unrestrained expression of opinion, means exposure to them. Hence, any reform in matters of suffrage is stoutly resisted, for while they can regulate the method by which the ballot may be used, it is equivalent to destroying its power of expression. It protects the exclusive class of society, and also the money power, as much so as if the ballot was a blank.

The honesty of the ballot is, therefore, the key by which these apparently difficult problems may be solved, for the great trouble now in social reform, is to discover some method of education that will educate, and yet disguise to the educated people the fact of being previously imposed upon.

POPULAR SUFFRAGE.

In the discussion of the present social difficulties the question of suffrage should be fairly considered. The right to vote is a born right and merely protected by legislative enactments. The mistake of considering the right of suffrage as being conferred upon the people by authority of legislative bodies, makes the great confusion of ideas in ballot reform.

The power of legislators is conferred upon them by the people, and when the honest principle of government is considered it cannot embrace the right for legislators to dictate the source of their power. Men who are sincere doubtless understand this, but mankind are not honest toward each other, and the men elected to make laws are no exception. It is, therefore, a mere delusion that the people of the United States enjoy popular suffrage, for the greed of man for power is derived from the desire to get more than what belongs to him.

All creatures want their liberty as soon as the desire is born, and the very essence of knowledge is conscious-

ness. The necessity of commerce is the fundamental principle of society, but when legislators undertake to regulate human nature they display their own by assuming more power than the elective principle confers upon them. It is claimed that men have a right to vote as they have a mind to, and if that is so why are our legislators so much concerned about training the voter before he is permitted to exercise his natural right ?

All persons who are sincere in promoting the general welfare of society will recognize the virtue of human nature over any authority that man has yet developed. Such persons will also recognize the rights of others by their own feelings, and when a person feels that he must influence others to vote just as he does, can he explain by what authority he assumes this right of influence, when it deprives the other of the same privilege ? The principle of suffrage is the liberty to struggle for one's own existence, and the influence surrounding such life is the blight to be overcome by the instinct of human nature. Hence, the man or woman who discovers this will vote as they have a mind to ; by expressing their honest opinion regardless of the influence of others, who are entitled to the same privilege.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

In considering the present agitation of society, one should be very careful to avoid being governed by their personal desires. The individual determines his own wants by such influences as may surround him, and it is a very unjust conclusion to determine the wants of others who may be surrounded by influences entirely unknown to the most critical observer.

A person needs only to study himself, to determine the amount of intemperance another should bear. It may

also be acknowledged to one's own mind that the mere feeling of superiority will not insure a humble submission from those who are looked upon as inferior. The numerical strength of an organization is derived from the association of individuals in the possession of mutual ideas. The number merely represents a defensive support and in no sense establishes any greater claim to a superior system, than if it was the ideal of an individual mind.

General society is based upon the eternal nature of things. Commerce is but the natural activity of mankind, for its only choice is to be active or die. The small circle which the individual may control is but a subordinate social system, and however sincere or firm he may be in believing the whole world could embrace his system, peace and the brotherhood of man could not be an accomplished fact. Nature will not permit such a visionary system becoming a reality. It is also clear enough, for an ideal state of perfection would destroy the incentive to an intercourse; hence, commerce and activity would cease, and the freedom of man would be wanting under a fixed condition.

Mankind is compelled to live in society or cease to exist. An established system should never be confounded with the eternal or general system, for by this means a mind may easily be trained into a prejudiced condition, when a charitable disposition toward others would depend upon their being warped into the same shape.

The individual or association will continue to hold their position while they can defend it. All systems of society that man establishes are subordinate to the one great system his very existence depends upon. Therefore, an established wrong will flourish until it comes in conflict with the general system, and to understand what was absolutely right would destroy the further effort of seeking it.

It is plain, therefore, that the man who accomplishes most in his limited lifetime is he who acts from his individual conviction; and from the fact that civilization is the most advanced when individual liberty is the most persistent, it follows that the social welfare of humanity can be protected by an honest expression of the majority without regard to condition or sex.

There is no evidence in history or from the results of the present systems of training, that a body of men can usurp the power of Nature and train others, or in reality assume an authority over their very source. Progress takes place in proportion to the individual courage to defy the organized system of society. This always meets persecution, for while a prevailing system of society is due to the individual effort, of which its magnates freely boast, they are equally as persistent in defending their position against further growth.

When it is considered that the natural desire to progress is the very commerce of life and must therefore be individual, it should be equally seen that the social difficulties are constantly improved in proportion to the acknowledged individuality of opinion. Furthermore, it should be apparent that progress is derived from the necessities of general society, defended by nature against all the subordinate associations that man establishes. This places the individual conscience in a position to determine what is best for one's self. Upon this principle governments have been established by a system of suffrage. Now, the right to vote is nothing more than the right to breathe; it is not conferred by institutions or any system of training; it is inspired from the spirit of self-defence. It is therefore individual, and ballot reform or any improved system of voting by which the individual may express his or her convictions, will accomplish more social reform than all the theories and fanciful ideas of perfection that man's mind ever conceived.

PERSONAL IMPORTANCE.

It is often taught that unselfishness is a virtue, and to cultivate a generous spirit toward humanity should be the aim of every person. Let us consider the peculiar inconsistency of this sentiment. Where are the people who are what they pretend to be? It is not the purpose of this writing to disturb the serene confidence which people repose in each other, but rather to call attention to one's self, leaving the conclusion to the individual conscience.

It is the instinct of every living thing to cultivate their personal desire, and this may be personally disputed, but the sincerity of a person who would proclaim a willingness to sacrifice their desire can be doubted by a thorough study of oneself. The man who discovers his own ability to deceive and also maintain a respectable social position, taking to himself the flattering attention while he earnestly laments the wickedness of the world, he can well say: "Things are not what they seem."

While the inherent sense of self-preservation is doubtless the most prominent feature in man, he can also study himself, and determine by what means only, to what extent he is willing to curb his own desires. There are plenty of maxims and rules of human duty, but how many people are there who will not find some excuse for themselves, and apply these rules to others? The experience of life betrays the deceptive character of man toward man, it cannot fail to convince him who has put his trust in what was taught and then discover by experience that the teaching was false.

The principle feature of teaching moral duty is to protect the method or system taught. Now, in the apparent antagonism between different schools of morality it betrays a motive of personal importance. The effect to obstruct the one and introduce the others should throw a

doubt upon the necessity of moral teaching, and disclose a suspicion at least, that the motive was hidden by the careful construction of language. Also it may be seen that a free expression of opinion must necessarily be discountenanced by all schools of morality.

No person can be harmed by reading or listening to ideas of which they have no comprehension, hence it follows that those only are disturbed who can discern an opposite sentiment to their own, which will also disclose to such minds their own importance. It must be seen, therefore, that by the same rule of reasoning all schools of morality are very partial to a self-sacrificing spirit, the teaching of which is really an evil, for it promotes a personal importance. If a man cannot deprive himself, having a better knowledge of the world than those he would teach, surely his inconsistency must be apparent to himself even if he can persuade others to the contrary.

The force of moral teaching is destroyed when it is administered by a person who by his example shows that he makes an exception of himself. It may be noticed by an ordinary observer as well as by personal experience, perhaps, that whatever is unpleasant to the sense of the individual he can reprove others for. Take for instance the use of tobacco, which scarcely any one recommends. The man who has no desire for it can exhibit his disgust for the filthy habit because it does not disturb his own desires. But every man must have desires or he has no comprehension of sense. He simply cultivates his mind to believe that his desires are more in accord with reason. No persons in health will injure themselves which the cultivation of one's desires prove. Hence, a man who assumes to reform others must be able to see, if he excepts himself and those of similar ideas, it must be far more difficult for those to reform who are unconscious of a wicked desire. It would seem to be more in accord with

the facts that teachers of morality cultivated their own desires at the expense of those whom they would endeavor to teach. When we see people who consume in luxurious living the product of ten times their own number it surely proves a greater care for themselves than those who perform the labor. It is also a curious inconsistency that first persuades an inoffensive laborer to curb his own desires until in distress and poverty he is sneered at as being vulgar and dirty. This condition is then pointed out by the very men who, possessing superior knowledge, are all the more accountable for robbing the laborer of his natural innocence, making of him the target of reform by pretending to reform him.

THE DECEPTION OF VOTING.

Nothing is clearer than that the principle of voting is derived from—a natural difference of opinion. It is an admission of a difference, for any one can see, if humanity were of one mind, the brotherhood of man often spoken of by reformers would be a fixed fact. Neither a government or any method of voting would be needed. Everything would be just right, activity would be so uniform that the smiling features of one would be the features of all.

In considering the social question of the day, the importance of an honest method of balloting should engage the attention of every sincere reformer. History records a studied effort of literary workers to justify the power of the strong to oppress the weak. No one can write without reflecting their character, and an honest opinion, however different from current expressions it may be, will be readily recognized by those who seek with a sincere purpose. But by those who are looking for the means to

justify their personal desires, the means of painting deception to give it the appearance of honesty will engage their exclusive attention.

We often hear people assert that an exclusive class of society has always existed and always will exist. It is with quite an air of importance that some assert their settled convictions ; it sounds more like an echo than a sense of conception. It is of minor importance whether this is a fact or not, for all writers will expose their own failings to a much greater extent than others can point them out. Also, the same principle will apply to people of exclusive ideas. For instance : If a man is sincere, he will not disguise his method of action for a personal benefit ; for the detection of self-interest in a reformer stamps him to be a fraud, even if his teaching be virtue itself.

Now, the pretence of a cultivated man in assisting the common illiterate people, while he defends the exclusive claim of society, is a fraud. Why ? Because the effort has always been encouraged by literary people in general to ridicule the crude expression of common humanity. This betrays a personal protection to be more prominent than the pretended assistance so freely offered. It is the privilege, therefore, of every individual, whether he expresses himself by word or ballot, to determine from the standpoint of his own interest whether he expresses his own opinion or that which others have taught him.

If it is right for the cultured class of society to control political methods by the power to do it, it is surely inconsistent to advocate the right of illiterate people to vote, or even those who are first taught ; for practically the influence of the vote is in the hands of the teacher, who could more consistently govern the illiterate man by voting for him, than take the trouble to teach him how to vote. It is therefore clear that the formality of voting is known to be a deception by the very ones who pretend to

serve the ignorant and illiterate. Also, the same propensity in man to prefer being served, rather than perform the necessary toil himself, is apparent in proportion to one's culture; and let a man do what he will he cannot disguise his deception when he must first persuade the innocent workmen that mental labor should be rewarded by luxuries for pointing out the wickedness of the world. What can be more inconsistent than for men who know by experience of their own wickedness, to teach the innocence of humanity that the righteous live in luxury as a reward for knowing how to do it.

THE RELATION OF STATE TO THE INDIVIDUAL MAN.

What does State mean? No man can change *the State* into, a state, by the mere defining of words. The State is as much a matter of infinite existence as light; it is as positive as the sun's rays. It is therefore beyond the limit of man's power to control the State. The limitation of man is his power to establish a state, and when we are talking about State, we should be careful, if the intention is honest, to make the distinction clear between the State and a state.

Having determined in our minds that the highest character of State is a positive condition entirely above the results of man's volition, the authority of man over man should be seen by every person who was willing to exchange either goods or ideas justly. The refined class of society admit they were previously depraved, or they deny their refinement; but what can be said of a "refined man" who claims an ownership of his fellow-man because he feels himself superior to those around him, or because others are as ignorant and depraved as he admits by his claim upon refinement to have been his previous condition?

The great questions of life are : Can a man be wicked and not know it ? Is a man a sovereign in his own home ? Is any other man, by reason of any particular cultivation or official character, more sovereign than the father of his children ? In brief, is it right for *a state* to possess the same attitude toward the domestic relations as the State ? By the confusion of words and double definitions applied to words of ethical significance, a state which man establishes is assumed to be equal in authority to the positive action of the State which ethical writers quite often claim to be a dependency upon a state wholly of man's creation. If the reader disputes this by saying that man does nothing or has no power to create a state, the same reader could doubtless attempt to tell us what particular acts he performs that he is responsible for ?

If what is termed "cultivated man" has thus acquired an ownership to the uncultivated to such an extent that a state of any character has a priority of authority greater than a father over his children, who are dependent upon parental love for existence, the word, consistency, should be blotted out of the English language.

The fact is, a state is established as an appendage to the State, and derived from parental love in consequence of a forced necessity, a natural necessity, for people of different ideas to live in social peace. Life would be a failure if people were born grown up, and wickedness is as necessary for a background for goodness, as death is to a conscious knowledge of growth. If we become more refined as a people, it settles the question of our previous condition, but is it the reward of true refinement to possess a right to establish a state to protect the natural disposition of the ignorant to serve ?

Parental love is not derived from cultivation, which is proved by the tender regard of all creatures for their young. Therefore, if the State or Nation shows such a

persistent authority over the reproduction of living creatures, is it not the height of folly to assume that a man must define the word State in such a manner as to disguise his greed or love of being served? What would mankind ever have amounted to if the domestic state had not preceded the cultivated state? Now because we can grow should we despise our childhood? Also how could we resist the desire for ease or laziness, but for the observation of the innocence of children, or the love of our own?

Hence, the relation of a state to the State should be clear, and no sincere man should confound the two states, which the double definition of words confound, in self-justification of a man's claim to an authority over the children of another. The man who steals will use more exertion to excuse the act than it would have taken to earn an honest living, and the attempt of writers to predict the reverting of civilization back into barbarism is analogous to the fear of a man turning into a child if the aristocratic class of society should refuse to eat the potatoes produced by the labor of an unrefined man.

To recognize the State is to recognize God, and to cling to a state derived from the greed and selfishness of man, is to recognize idolatry and encourage a system of compulsory servitude. Man grows by one principle—intercourse—commerce—the exchange of ideas—and there is no surer sign of an idolatrous person than his utterance that goodness is monopolized by a specific class of society, while all others are steeped in wickedness. The honorable man has no need to assert it for himself; if he acts honorable it will be so apparent that to assert it would veil the fact. Also the character of God is not superior to the truth, and the cunning of man is never called upon to protect, the State, by any specific form of a state.

A class of society or system of government are formulated from the will of man. The fact that they grow

is the supposition they are improved upon the same principle that a child grows to be a man. Therefore, a state is improved in proportion to a more mutual understanding of ideas which are always derived from the State or the individual will. To obtain an expression of the will is the object of voting and if a state is possible to direct or influence the will it is a mere abstract of the State which is the spirit of parental love as shown by the parent for its young. Hence, a state is the creature of the State and no system of government formulated by man has authority of as high an order as the authority of the parent over his child. All society is secondary to domestic society and the majority of individuals protect morality by the force of the will, for the power of love will always subdue hate. It should be clear to every parent at least that a state is improved just as rapidly as he dares to express his opinion unbiased by the influence of others. It should also be clear that no system of government could ever be superior to that from which it is derived. A state is, therefore, improved in proportion to a method of voting, by which the popular will is more honestly obtained.

WORDS ARE NOT LANGUAGE.

There are doubtless those who sincerely believe that words constitute language, but in a strict sense, which experience only can determine, words are not language. There is no origin of words any more than there is to the shape of a crooked stick. It is impossible to define a word to a limit, hence the difficulty of conveying a clear understanding of ideas is so great, that any written matter can be literally disputed.

Language is the expression of everything. Whatever has an influence upon the mind is language. It can,

therefore, be readily claimed that words are language, but it can be readily disputed, for while they could be such to one, to another in the absence of their expressing anything, they would be nothing at all. The same sound may be heard, the same forms may be seen by two persons, from which two distinct impressions are made, hence language has no definable shape. It is, therefore, an influence without a specific shape to determine what the influence is. When two persons will make a careful comparison of an influence from the same object, it will be seen that language is the force of expression of the object rather than what is expressed. That is to say the two persons could readily see they could not confound the object, it may be a word, with the true sense of language, for while a force of conveyance was derived from the object, equally, the conception in both cases was different.

Words are the measures of language, the same as a peck measure is the measure of corn. A mark is made with chalk, which conveys an expression, it is a word, it is neither the chalk nor the expression, for the mark could be rubbed out while the chalk and expression both could not be destroyed. Learned men understand this principle, yet the specific form of words to convey an expression is taught with severe exactness. The act of expression is no more changed by the method, than a piece of meat is changed by being conveyed to the mouth with a fork or with the fingers.

The difference between words and what they express is the same as that between experience and information. The former is a fact and the latter is a form. Hence, the learning of words which is called education by some, is no more such in a strict sense than four peck measures are a bushel of corn. It is claimed that knowledge is conveyed in words and by the same authority, the impossibility of conveying experience is admitted, therefore, of what value

is the knowledge which words convey, while the sense of experience has acquired nothing?

It should be clear, therefore, that words are the mere measures of the force of expression—language. Also that the literal sense of knowledge is the experience of a form, either information or a measure of language; the same as a man would receive a variety of empty measures to measure his corn, if he could raise the corn. The extravagant forms which are being taught in the public schools should open the eyes of every man who has to work to pay his taxes. It is called education, and the learned men who would disguise the true sense of things by their superior knowledge of forms of expression are not sincere in their professed kindness toward humanity. The man who will cheat in the size of the measure will cheat in the substance to be measured. He will first instruct the innocent scholar that words are knowledge, and from these measures he will teach a specific authority over experience. It practically means that the imitation is superior to the real, but a person must be educated to a specific gauge to believe it, for experience will not only disclose the deception, but will reveal also that language is the force of conception, which no imitation will satisfy after experience takes place.

Man admits by the deceptive means he employs, that he is not honest enough to teach his kind. The records that history bear show plainly that the learned men who have dubbed each other educated, are more intent upon increasing their own power and luxury, than enlightening the real laborers. Education and influence are identical terms, and teaching cannot be applied without intent. Hence, everything the senses conceive, being an influence of some character, it is good or bad in proportion to the innocence of intent. That is to say, the man who acts from a conviction derived from experience will exert a

good influence, while he who acts from a confidence in the information derived from others will not only exert a bad influence, but come to grief himself.

AN AMERICAN METHOD OF BALLOTING.

VOTING BY MAIL OR IN PERSON, SECRETLY OR PUBLICLY.

It is the conditions that obstruct the present system of a Republican Government and makes direct ballot reform impossible. The possible wickedness of man makes a need for, and also corrupts a government which will never rise superior to the people, and if corrupt even the people should cheerfully acknowledge it by reason of its necessity. Also because it is the best we have got.

The first principle that should guide the government official is to realize and also acknowledge the people as the supreme power, and that their welfare was above personal interests. Besides, conditions must be considered, the same as a farmer would consider the soil before he would condemn the purest seed.

This American method of balloting depends upon conditions. First, the legislative body of a government should be composed of one body only. Second, political organization should be confined to locality. That is to say, towns and districts should not have any political connection, no general machine like the present system. The possibility of attaining these conditions depends upon the popular understanding and whatever system of voting is in vogue, whereby the people may express their untrammelled opinion—a popular demand—not such as a few men can voice by means of the press, but such a demand as comes from the people, when each person shouts for himself. This must occur before any hope of so radical a

reform could be expected. In fact, all reform springs from the clamor of the oppressed, and never from the oppressor.

We will, therefore, suppose these conditions to exist by virtue of a State Constitution, namely: The authority of government invested in one legislative body, which will be empowered to elect a Governor, Representatives to Congress, Judiciary Officials, and all the minor State Officers.

The legislative body would simply be a condensation of the people, and it being the essential feature of this system to recognize the people as the supreme power, all specific acts of the Legislature should be referred back to the people for ratification. The method of which will be shown in the general system of balloting.

With these conditions, all the people would be required to ballot for would be one man; say to represent about 5,000 inhabitants. The nomination of candidates to be as follows: Any method by which the individual man or woman chose to present the name of a candidate to a town or district clerk. These names should be kept secret by enclosing in a sealed box until an appointed day to publicly declare the names of the appointed candidates. It is safe to suppose that two names would receive the bulk of the votes, as no restrictions could be enforced upon local politics, and if it was known that the two names receiving the highest number of votes were to be the regular nominees, it would be all the more probable that two would receive the bulk of the votes. If a tie vote results, then three or four names could be added to the general ballot.

Now, that two or more names are declared to be the candidates for the State Legislature, they are to be voted for as follows: A ballot should be arranged in a double

form for the purpose of having a duplicate like the illustration.

[ORIGINAL.]	[DUPLICATE.]
For Representative to the General Court of Massachusetts.	For Representative to the General Court of Massachusetts.
JOHN SMITH, . . YES. SARAH JONES, . . YES.	JOHN SMITH, . . YES. SARAH JONES, . . YES.

To justly recognize the right of a voter to vote secretly, is consistent only when it is also a recognized right to vote publicly. Therefore, after a ballot is arranged satisfactorily, the legal voter may cut out the word "yes" against the name he wishes to discard, thus leaving for instance the name Sarah Jones, yes, upon the ballot.

The result of the vote should be declared in a local paper by publishing each ballot, with the numbers, as follows :

FOR REPRESENTATIVE TO THE GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS.

At a regular election held in the town of——, in the month of——, in the year ——, the result was as follows, and is hereby certified to.

(The number represents the individual ballot and should compare with the duplicate voucher retained by the legal voter.) For Sarah Jones, ballot number 1, 2, 4, total, 3. For John Smith, ballot number 3, 5, total, 2.

The negative vote would not need to be published, for every ballot would contain one name only with the word, yes, following.

It should be optional with the voter whether he signs his name or not to the ballot, for if he desired to vote secretly he could deliver his vote in person to the official authorized to receive it. This double ballot may be put into a box which by mechanical contrivance will number

both ballot and duplicate alike; the ballot being retained in the box, while the duplicate will be cut off and dropped outside; and if the voter desires to be very secret about it, he could deposit his ballot and receive his duplicate without even the official being aware of how he voted. The numbers need not necessarily be consecutive. The duplicate would be the voucher, and the voter should treasure it in proportion to his sincerity in desiring an honest election.

This American system would make woman suffrage more practical, for if a person desires to vote by use of the mails, it would only be necessary to sign his or her name, perhaps in the presence of a witness, to prevent fraud. In this case the voucher could be returned by mail.

An absolute majority of the legal voters should be required to elect, and if the people failed to give a candidate a majority, they should be deprived of a representative until they did, for it is the essential feature of this system that no man shall act in any official capacity without the consent of an actual majority. It is a universal law that the majority of any considerable number of people under natural conditions are always in the right, by reason of Nature holding the balance of power; if otherwise the population of the globe would decrease, and it would be only a question of time when the earth would become barren.

All the possible objections to this system could not be forestalled in this brief writing, but every emergency is believed to be provided for. Municipal or town officials could be elected by the same system, but as this system is founded upon an honest majority to constitute the ruling power, it does not proscribe rules. It suggests, however, that cities or towns be acknowledged to possess sovereign rights in whatever pertained to their exclusive interests.

The importance of only one legislative body is an essential condition, for it is this feature that both simplifies and removes the old hobby of recognizing an aristocratic class to guard against the danger of the common people controlling the Government. It is plain to be seen, however, if the common people have a right to vote, it is because they have a right to determine how, and by whom the government will be administered. Hence, the rights of the people must be recognized before any possible improvement can be had in our present ballot system.

Now, if the people are the higher power, which is often proclaimed, no act of the Legislature should be superior to the will of the majority of the people. Therefore, the people should be considered the highest authority ; and if not, why not ?

What is now termed the Upper House or Senate Chamber should be composed of the whole people of the State. Every act of the Legislature could be referred to the people, or only such specific acts as the people chose to act upon. This would remove any objections to a single body of legislators. For they would simply be a committee to condense measures for the people to act upon, or dispose of entirely. Bribes would be useless even if possible. Also the majority of the people are not so ignorant as to be obliged to inquire what was for their best interests.

The simplicity by which the people could ratify the acts of the legislature may be seen as follows : The special act or acts of a whole session could be printed and forwarded by mail to every legal voter in the State, or even the telegraph system could be utilized. The words yes and no should be printed at the end of each act, or recommendation of the legislature, when the same method of procedure could be adopted as in a regular election. Towns or cities would publish the local result, and the general summary be published in a State paper.

It is not necessary to consider here the many advantages of this method, but it is believed that the corruption and frauds of the present elections could be successfully overcome by it. It would also dissolve all the great social evils of the day, and questions could be quickly disposed of, that are now but a tedious wrangle, it would protect the rights of all, and make life worth the living. This subject should be carefully considered by every sincere man and woman, and if many objections can be seen in this presentation, it will not change the fact that an honest expression of the people is possible whenever they possess courage enough to demand it.





125 1911

